A

DEFENCE

OF THE

DOCTRINE

OF THE

Resurrection of the Same Body.

In Two Parts.

In the First of which

The Character, Writings and Religious Principles of Mr. *Lock* are Distinctly Considered:

And, in the Second,

The Doctrine of the Resurrection of the *Same Body* is at large Explained and Defended, against the Notions and Principles of that Gentleman, *&c.*

By *WINCH HOLDSWORTH*, D. D.
Fellow of St. *John Baptist* College in *Oxford.*

LONDON:
Printed for Charles Rivington, at the *Bible* and *Crown* in St. *Paul's* Church-Yard.
MDCCXXVII.


BRITISH MUSEUM

PREFACE.

THE Author of the Letter, to which theſe Papers are an Anſwer, is a Perſon entirely unknown. He ſtyles Himſelf, at preſent, the Author of *A Defence of Mr.* Lock's *Eſſay of Human Underſtanding*. It ſeems, This is not the Firſt Time, He has been engaged for Him. And, He tells Us,

in His Preface, that, if it is poſſible for Him to be able, it ſhall not be the Laſt. I ſee, it is my Misfortune to have attacked an invincible Defender. He is Reſolute, and Impenetrable. And Conviction is not to be Forced. I muſt appeal, therefore, to the World. And, I hope, there are Yet Thoſe in it, Who are qualified to make a Right Judgment between Us. It was out of Regard to Such, that This Diſpute was deſired to be made Publick. It paſſed, at Firſt, in Private; And, it had been buried in the Silence it deſerves: If the Enlargement of Truth had not been a more Generous, and Neceſſary Concern, than Either the Satisfaction, or Reputation, of any Private Man.

Mr.

Mr. *Lock* hath Uſurped in the Empire of Learning too Much, and too Long. It is Time He ſhould be depoſed from His Tyranny; And brought down to His Proper Sphere. It was not to be endured, that Religion ſhould be Sacrificed in the Worſhip paid to Him. It is, as ſervile, to follow Blindly the Tract of a Freethinker, as, the moſt Inveterate Impoſition. It is not worth while to Leave, even a dirty Road, for the Liberty of breaking over Hedge, and Ditch.

Not, that, Religion ſuffers by Freedom of Debate. Freedom of Debate is very well conſiſtent with Steddineſs of Faith. But, there are ſome Things to be admitted without Diſputing. Nothing can be

more abſurd, than to be always putting Firſt Principles upon the Proof. The Apoſtle's Rule is incomparable. *Prove All Things*: But it is, by, *holding faſt That, which is good.*

LET the Writer of the Letter have his Liberty to think, as Freely, as Mr. *Lock*. I take Mine, to think different from Them Both. But He, only, that thinks with Truth, thinks with the moſt perfect Freedom. The Defence of That Friend, is an Inducement to write, which, even, an honeſt Man may be proud to own. That Friend cannot dye: But will always live to defend the Defenders of it. Our Author's Friend, Mr. *Lock*, is dead. And Our Author ſeems to think it hard, that He ſhould be aſſaulted, when He cannot

not defend Himſelf. But His Writings, His Doctrines, and Opinions, are alive. And if They are the Truth; He will never want a Defender. But if They appear to be Falſe; The Pains, even of Our Author Himſelf, or of an Abler Hand, will be beſtow'd in Vain. Smooth Language, and conſident Affirmations, how often ſoever repeated, are not Reaſoning; Nor can They ſupport any Man's Credit, or Conduct. The Weight of Truth alone will ſink Him. If Mr. *Lock*'s Works prove Him to have been a *Socinian*, The Truth of That Matter of Fact anſwers a Thouſand Denyals, and a Thouſand Stories, from Men of Probity, and Station. If any Thing of the *Firſt Kind* therefore appear, in Anſwer to This, the Author is, hereby, deſired, not to ex-

pect a Return; If any Thing, of the *Latter*, it will be no Trouble to me to ſee it: But I don't promiſe to take any Publick Notice of it.



CON-

CONTENTS.

PART I.

INTRODUCTION.

CHAP. I.

Mr. Lock, *Whether a* Socinian, *in General?*

CHAP. II.

Whether Socinian, *in the Doctrine of the Trinity, in Particular?*

SECT. I.

Proofs, that Mr. Lock *was a* Socinian, *in this Doctrine, from* the Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity, *and the* Two Vindications *of it.*

SECT. II.

Proofs, from his Notes and Paraphraſe *upon the Epiſtles of St.* Paul.

SECT.

SECT. III.

Proofs, from His Writings, *that he maintain'd many other* Socinian *Doctrines.*

SECT. IV.

Proofs, that he was a Man of unwarrantable Latitude, in his Principles of Religion.

SECT. V.

Proofs, that He deny'd the Doctrine of the Trinity, *in his Diſpute with the Biſhop of* Worceſter.

PART II.

CHAP. I.

Of the Reſurrection of the ſame Body *in General.*

SECT. I.

The Queſtion ſtated.

SECT.

SECT. II.

The first General Defence of Mr. Lock *considered.*

SECT. III.

The Second General Defence of Mr. Lock *considered.*

SECT. IV.

The Third General Defence of Mr. Lock *considered.*

SECT. V.

The Fourth General Defence of Mr. Lock *considered.*

CHAP. II.

The Opinion and Authority of the Ancient Writers *of the Christian Church, as to This Doctrine, considered.*

CHAP. III.

Of the Sense of the Ancient Creeds, *as to This Doctrine.*

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

The First Head of the Sermon Considered, and Defended.

SECT. I.

Identity *stated.*

SECT. II.

Mr. Lock's Identity *not approved of.*

SECT. III.

The Vulgar *Consideration of* Identity *most proper to be applied to the Resurrection.*

SECT. IV.

This, *different from Mr.* Lock's *Identity.*

SECT. V.

This Identity *not entirely different from the Bishop of* Worcester's.

SECT. VI.

Nor from the Identity *commonly received.*

SECT.

SECT. VII.

The Advantages of ſtating Identity *in this Manner Conſidered, and Defended in Oppoſition to Mr.* Lock's *Notion of it.*

CHAP. V.

The Paſſages of Scripture, produced in the Sermon, for the Reſurrection of the Same Body, *Conſidered, and Defended.*

SECT. I.

Of the Senſe and Expreſſions of the Scripture, in General.

SECT. II.

The Firſt Text for the Reſurrection of the Same Body, *produced in the Sermon, conſidered at large, and the Application of it Defended.* ROM. viii. 11.

SECT. III.

The Second Text Conſider'd, and Defended.

SECT. IV.

The Third Text Conſidered, and Defended.

SECT.

SECT. V.

Paſſages of Mr. Lock *concerning his State of the Reſurrection, in his third Letter to the Biſhop of* Worceſter, *Conſidered, and Anſwer'd.*

SECT. VI.

Whether any Real Diſtinction, in the Scriptures, between the Dead, and the Bodies *of the Dead, as Mr* Lock *affirms.*

SECT. VII.

A Large Paſſage out of Mr. Lock's *Third Letter to the Biſhop of* Worceſter, *Conſidered, and Anſwer'd.*

SECT. VIII.

Paſſages of Scripture, produced in the Sermon, not conſidered by Mr. Lock's *Friend, and left unanſwer'd.*

CHAP. VI.

Proofs for the Reſurrection of the Same Body, *from Congruities in the Nature of God, and Man, Conſidered, and Defended.*

SECT.

SECT. I.

The Congruity from the Nature of God, Conſidered, and Defended.

SECT. II.

The Congruity from the Nature of Man, Conſidered, and Defended.

SECT. III.

No Reſurrection, without the Reſurrection of the Same Body.

SECT. IV.

Mr. Lock's *State of the Reſurrection, by which the* Souls *of Men are ſuppoſed to be United to* New, *and* Other *Bodies, No proper Reſurrection, but a* New Life.

CHAP. VII.

The Fourth Enquiry of the Sermon paſſed over.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

The Fifth Enquiry of the Sermon, as far as Mr. Lock *is concern'd in it, Conſidered, and Defended.*

CONCLUSION.

ERRATA.

PAge 2. Line 20. for *Service*, read *Juſtice*. p. 15. l. ult. after *That*, r. *it*. p. 37. l. 6. for *Whereas*, r. *And*. p. 50. l. 3. for *debate*, r. *debaſe*. ib. l. 8. dele *not*. p. 55. l. 23. after *him*, dele *Self*. p. 95. l. 18. for *Uncomitible*, r. *Uncomatable*. p. 104. l. 11. for *Altitude*, r. *Attitude*. p. 115. l. 27. for *Stakly*, r. *Stably*.

A DEFENCE OF THE Doctrine, &c.

PART I.

Introduction.

SIR,



Acknowledge the Civility you do Me, in ſending Me your Animadverſions upon my Sermon, before they were made publick. It is not, I think, uſual, to take ſuch particular Notice of Diſcourſes of that Kind, ſo long after they have been ſent into the World. But in this You are to do as you pleaſe. And I could

eaſily paſs it over, without giving you the Trouble of an Excuſe. You are free, no queſtion, to defend Mr. *Lock*, and his Opinions, againſt all the World; but whether You may always do an Act of Juſtice, as You call it, to him, in defending him, is not ſo certain. He may poſſibly receive greater Juſtice from Hands that treat him rougher, than you appear inclin'd to do. You ſeem to have form'd him for a Kind of Heroe; and you know that ſuch Characters are uſually drawn beyond what is ſtrictly juſt. I will permit you therefore to ſay that his Name will never dye; but I beg Leave to add, that thoſe Words do not always imply real Worth, Virtue, or Goodneſs, the proper and valuable Foundations of laſting Fame, or Reputation.

When You acknowledge your Intentions to do Mr. *Lock* Service, You would oblige me to ſuppoſe, that a Love of Truth, and a Concern for the Intereſts of Religion, are the only Motives to your Writing. And the Defence of Mr. *Lock* may poſſibly be very conſiſtent with Truth, and Religion. But then I muſt add, that it is certainly a Motive diſtinct from them Both; and if That were a Third Motive, 'tis plain, the other Two were not the only Motives. But if Prejudice alſo, and Partiality, and a blind Veneration for a celebrated Name, ſhould be

be found to have carried you into, or mixed in This your Defence of him, then your Purpoſe of Defending him would manifeſtly take away the Force of your other Motives from Truth, and Religion. This is often the Caſe, when Men are ſtrongly attached to the Reputation, Opinions, and Deciſions, of Perſons of Character, and Diſtinction, in the Learned World. And you may, if you pleaſe, believe me, when I tell you, it is here your own Caſe. For all your Papers are full of Mr. *Lock*, his Weight, his Greatneſs, his celebrated Name; You ſeem ſo reſolute to think Highly of him, and to defend Him Throughly, that I think I may, without Prejudice againſt you, ſuppoſe, that you write for him upon other Inducements, beſides meerly thoſe of Truth, and Religion.

I cannot promiſe You therefore to conſider Your Letter, in the ſame Spirit, with which you writ it, becauſe I do not preſume at preſent ſufficiently to know, what manner of Spirit you are of. But however, I hope 'twill be in my Power to treat you perſonally with Decency, and Reſpect, whatever Opinion I may have of your Writings. I do not think myſelf in Danger of becoming your Enemy, when you tell me the Truth: And I am ſure, I ſhall have much leſs Reaſon to be ſo, for telling

you the Truth myſelf. How far you have convinced me, that I have been too ſevere upon your Great Man, You will ſee, when you have read through theſe Papers. And if it ſhould happen, that the Conviction is not ſo great as You could wiſh, I hope you will not ſuppoſe, that it is occaſioned by any Diſpleaſure, I have for you, ſince You know Writers are not always ſo happy, as to obtain the Succeſs, which they hope for, or deſire.

You join with me in confeſſing, that there is a Zeal which is juſt in the Defence of Articles of the Chriſtian Faith, even againſt Perſons of the greateſt Characters; but you immediately interpoſe an allaying Caution by adding, "That a Per-
"ſon of ſuch Diſtinction ſhould not in
"Prudence be charged as guilty of oppo-
"ſing the Chriſtian Faith, except the Fact
"was plain, and he did it openly, and di-
"rectly." And this is ſuch Prudence, as I confeſs, I am not very willing to learn. For why muſt I be obliged to ſtay till the laſt Criſis, before I put myſelf upon my Defence? All Men are not equal Judges even of the Plainneſs of a Matter of Fact. Every Man does, and muſt determine for himſelf of it, as ſoon, and according as the State of the Thing appears to him. If it appears plain to me, that a Man of Name,

and

and Learning, ſets himſelf to contradict Articles of Faith, I think myſelf in Duty bound to charge him, though your Man of Prudence may not yet have ſeen his Crime. And beſides, it is well known, that the Chriſtian Faith has been often ſcandalouſly contradicted, and corrupted, by Men, who did not profeſs direct, and open Oppoſition to it. Moſt of the Hereticks in the Chriſtian Church were in their own Times Men of Learning, and Eminence, and their Attacks upon the Faith were not always, openly, and directly, made, but were often advanced and maintain'd with Art, and Management, with evaſive Language, and ſophiſtical Reaſonings, and all other Pretences, proper to entangle, and deceive ſuch, as were not in the Secret of their Deſigns.

You ſeem to apprehend much "from "the Triumph of the Adverſaries of Truth, "and Religion, upon the giving up of a "Man of Learning to them, without open, "and direct, Proof made againſt him"; But ſure 'tis much more natural to preſume, that ſuch their Triumph muſt be capable of doing far leſs Miſchief, than the Artifices of a diſguiſed Enemy of the Faith, Unobſerved, and Undetected. Let them triumph, as they pleaſe, in ſuch an Acceſſion to them: Truth, and Religion never

ſuffer ſo much from open and profeſt Adverſaries, of whatſoever Abilities they are, as from ambiguous Friends, and ſecret Enemies. And if ſome Men are ſo weak and unfortunate, as to change or forſake their Faith, only, becauſe they reſolve to follow a Great Leader, yet ſure it is more deſirable, to ſee Them depart with him from the Society of the Faithful, than to remain undiſcovered among Them, and to ſpread their Corruptions wider.

The Prudence therefore, which You direct me to, appears to be falſe, and ill-grounded. And it would be very ſtrange, if any real Intereſt of the Church of Chriſt could be ſerved by it; Since falſe Friends are certainly better parted with, than kept, And, if it is not againſt the Intereſts of the Church to caſt out ſuch Traitors, who ſhelter in her Boſom; much leſs will it be either againſt Juſtice or Charity. For it is always to be conſidered, That Juſtice and Charity Both are in the firſt Place due to the Church itſelf, That great Body, which this ſecret Heretick endeavours to corrupt and poiſon; That, every good Chriſtian is bound to promote the Peace and Happineſs of This Body, as far as he has Power. And therefore, That, to ſet the Reputation or Intereſt of any private Heretick againſt theſe, is one of the greateſt

Vio-

Violations of Juſtice and Charity in the World. The Juſtice and Charity due to a Man, who ſecretly corrupts the Faith, require principally, that he ſhould be diſcover'd; that other Chriſtians ſhould have Notice given them, to avoid his wicked Infuſions; That, he himſelf ſhould be ſhewn, and, if poſſible, made ſenſible of his Error; And then, left to his Repentance. In ſuch a Conduct towards him, I am ſure, there can be no Injury done him; Moſt certainly, it is not always neceſſary, that a Man ſhould openly, and directly confeſs Hereſy, before he is cenſured for it; it is ſufficient Caution to Chriſtians, that there is ſtrong preſumptive Evidence, to encline Them to ſuſpect him. For in the Plague, the Infection may be mortal, before the Diſtemper appears.

You have, indeed, provided another ſoftning Argument to beſpeak either Juſtice, or Charity, or Both, for your Learned Man, before Cenſure paſs againſt him. And that is, by propoſing to have it conſidered, "Firſt, Whether the Matter in "Diſpute be an Acknowledged Article of "Faith?" But upon This, I muſt ask you, What you mean by an Acknowledged Article; If you mean, by theſe Words, ſuch Articles, as are acknowledged by Chriſtians of all kinds, and even by your

learned Heretick himſelf, Then To be ſure he will be ſecure long enough from Danger of Cenſure, ſince there are very few Articles of Faith, which all Denominations of Chriſtians will be found ſo far to agree in, as to cenſure Thoſe, who do not conſent to Them; And ſince there is much leſs Hopes that your Learned Man himſelf ſhould acknowledge that to be an Article of Faith, which he diſſents from, and ſo condemn himſelf. But if by an Acknowledged Article of Faith, you mean ſuch an one, whoſe Senſe, and Interpretation, has been received, and fixt, by the pureſt, and moſt primitive Church of Chriſt, and from That, by the Catholick Church ever ſince; If this may be the Senſe of an Acknowledged Article of Faith, then I ſay, That your Learned Man can have no Plea either from Juſtice, or Charity, to protect him from Cenſure, ſhould he either Artificially, and Secretly, and much leſs, ſhould he Openly, and Notoriouſly oppoſe, and contradict it.

So that your General Propoſitions, or Principles, as you call them, when diſtinctly conſidered, and examined, even without particular Application, are ſo far from being of that convincing Nature you ſuppoſe them to be, that they are not ſo much as true, but are falſe and miſchievous.

ous. And therefore, if you can neither defend Mr. *Lock*, nor examine my Behaviour to him, upon Topicks more to your Purpoſe than Theſe, you cannot be ſuppoſed to have a true Senſe of what Juſtice, Charity, and Prudence require in This Caſe; and I fear, have attempted more, than You are qualified to perform.

But I am to attend you thro' the particular Examination of my Sermon: And in this, it will appear, how unfortunate you alſo are, in making your particular Applications of theſe your falſe, and general Principles.

CHAP. I.

Mr. Lock, *Whether a* Socinian *in General?*

YOU begin with obſerving, that, "The "main Deſign of the Sermon is to "defend the Reſurrection of the *ſame Bo-* "*dy*; that, I ſay, Mr. *Lock* denies this; "That, I charge this his Denial with Here- "ſy; and that among other hard Words, "and Things, I tax Him with *Socinianiſm.*" You do not make this appear by particular Citations out of it; but you ſay it roundly at once; and I will not ſtand with you, at preſent; I admit it all to be true.

But

But the first Imputation upon Mr. *Lock*, which you single out to observe upon, is that of *Socinianism*. I had called Mr. *Lock* a *Socinian* Writer, which you think a Reflection upon Him without Grounds, and not to the Point contended for in the Sermon: Because, it seems, as you at first apprehended the Matter, "To be guilty of "*Socinian* Principles Mr. *Lock* must have "denied, or writ against, the Article of the "*Trinity*; neither of which, as you say, ap"pearing, and I not contending about that "Point in my Sermon, you supposed the "Charge of *Socinianism* upon Him, in it, "to be both impertinent, and unjust." This is your own Sense laid closer together, and without any Wrong done it: All the Misfortune is, that while you attempt to clear Mr. *Lock* from the Charge of being a *Socinian* Writer, and were wisely chiding me for calling Him such, you did not so much as know, what *Socinianism* was. One Article of the Christian Faith, (if it can be properly called one Article,) you had heard, that, the *Socinians* contradicted. Which was the Doctrine of the *Holy Trinity*; and this, you think, that, if you can prove Mr. *Lock* never did deny, you acquit Him from the Charge of *Socinian* Principles. It will be an harder Task upon you, than you think, to clear Mr. *Lock* thus far, but if you could,

He

He is not yet clear of *Socinian* Principles; for they lay much wider than the Doctrines which relate to the *Trinity*. I ſhall mention ſome of them.

1. THAT, the Notion of God was not implanted naturally in the Minds of Men. *(a)*

2. THAT, the Soul ſlept between Death and the Reſurrection. *(b)*

3. THAT, there is no Original Corruption of our Nature derived from *Adam*. *(c)*

Vid. Socin. prælect. Theolog. Cap. 2.

(*a*) Receptior hodie Sententia eſt, homini naturaliter ejuſq; animo inſitam eſſe divinitatis alicujus Opinionem. ——— Hæc Sententia, quam nos falſam eſſe arbitramur, non aliunde potius orta fuiſſe videtur, &c.

(*b*) Velim ſcias me ab iſtà quæſtione de Animæ Immortalitate abſtinuiſſe, ——— Tantum id mihi videtur ſtatui poſſe, poſt hanc vitam Animam ſive Animum hominis non ita per ſe ſubſiſtere, ut præmia ulla pœnaſve ſentiat, vel etiam iſta ſentiendi ſit capax. Quæ mea firma Opinio, &c. Socin. Ep. 5. ad Joh. Volkel. Crellius in Heb. 11. 40.

(*c*) Sunt qui velint (hæc quæ opinio vulgò recepta eſt) originale peccatum innatam quandam cupiditatem ſive Concupiſcentiam malam in homine eſſe, & ad peccandum Pronitatem. Opinio hæc verâ eſſe non poteſt. ——— Concludimus nullum, improprie etiam loquendo, Peccatum originale eſſe. Catech. Racor. Cap. 10. Quæſ. 2. Volkel. de verâ Relig. L. 5. Cap. 18.

4. THAT

4. That, Jeſus Chriſt did not make any proper Satisfaction to Divine Juſtice, for the Sins of Men. *(d)*

5. That, the Wicked ſuffer not eternal Torments after this Life. *(e)*

6. And that, the *ſame Bodies* ſhall not be raiſed again at the General Reſurrection. *(f)*

These are, All of them, known to be *Socinian* Principles; but, if you doubt it, you may turn to the Authors cited in the Margin. And if Theſe are *Socinian* Principles, then, Mr. *Lock*, when He writes for them, may be juſtly called a *Socinian* Writer; and more particularly, when He denies the Reſurrection of the *ſame Body*, a Preacher, in Defence of that Doctrine, may,

---

(*d*) Vid. Crell. contrà Grotium.

(*e*) Wolzogenius Com. in Matth. Cap. 25. 46. Ut Deus in omnibus juſtitiæ tenax eſt, ita hic quoq; ſuper neminem extendet pœnam meritis ejus majorem. Nulla autem poſſunt eſſe peccata tam gravia, quæ ſempiternis cruciatibus poſſunt æquari. Socin. Ep. ad Puc. & ad Volkel.

(*f*) Neq; Corpora in quibus reviviſcent, & venient mortui, ea ſunt Corpora in quibus Mortales vixerunt, & quorum Corruptione mortui ſunt, ſed illa longè iſtis ſunt præſtantiora. Slicting. Com. in 1 Cor. 15. 13. Crellij Com. in 1 Cor. 15. 14. Volkelius de verâ Relig. L. 3. Cap. 35. Smalcius Exam. Error. 89. Err.

without

without Impertinence, alſo charge Him, as a *Socinian* Writer. So that you now ſee, what Grounds there were, for what you call a Reflection upon Mr. *Lock*, That, it is juſtly founded; That, I did not go out of my Way to make it; That, I ſhould not have been juſt to the Subject, nor to the Audience, nor to the Reader, without conſidering what Mr. *Lock* had ſaid upon it.

You are exceedingly miſtaken therefore, when you ſuppoſe, that I cenſure Mr. *Lock* as a *Socinian*, in the Sermon, for denying the Doctrine of the *Trinity*. That Charge, I grant, had been foreign there; I had Matter againſt Him nearer; I had this *Socinian* Doctrine in View, which was naturally to be conſidered in the Diſcourſe; that, He deny'd the Reſurrection of the *ſame Body*. So that One of the Two Articles, upon which, you ſuppoſe, my Cenſure of Mr. *Lock* is grounded, is here ſunk into nothing. And you might have ſpared yourſelf the Trouble of writing, and me of reading your Defence of Him on that Head.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Mr. Lock, *Whether a* Socinian, *in the Doctrine of the* Trinity, *in particular?*

BUT becauſe you ſpend ſo many Pages in vindicating Mr. *Lock*, againſt what was not at firſt, by me, charged upon Him; and becauſe, you ſeem ſo very tender of his Reputation, in the Point of his Belief of the *Trinity*; I will beg leave to follow you, and conſider, what Force there is in the Evidence you have brought to prove Him ſound in this Doctrine.

BUT before I begin, I would have leave to ſay, That, I am far from taking any Malicious Pleaſure in fixing Errors, or Hereſies, upon Great, or Learned Men; and much leſs, do I think, every little Suſpicion ſufficient Ground to accuſe them of thoſe of the moſt dangerous, or criminal Kind. And This, I ſuppoſe, to be the Duty of all Men, who make Profeſſions of Eſteem, either for Learning, or Religion.

AND now, I go along with you. You are pleaſed to think, "That to defend Mr. "*Lock* from *Socinian* Principles with Re- "gard to the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, it "muſt be neceſſary, to conſider the Diſpute "between

" between Him, and Biſhop *Stillingfleet*; " becauſe the learned Biſhop ſaw, That, an " ill Uſe was made of the Terms, which " Mr. *Lock* had invented, by Heretical Men, " and becauſe, you think, This the Only " Alarm that was ever taken againſt Mr. " *Lock*, in thoſe Points. And you add, " That it is of Importance to obſerve, that " Mr. *Lock* never wrote Directly, or Indi- " rectly, concerning the *Trinity*, in his Eſ- " ſay, or any where elſe; and That, the Bi- " ſhop never ſuſpected Him of having done " ſo;" and This is your firſt Argument in this Matter; and by This, you think, you obtain your Purpoſe.

But, give me leave, Sir, to ask you, why I muſt neceſſarily be confined to the Diſpute between the Biſhop of *Worceſter*, and Mr. *Lock*, when I would conſider, whether This Great Friend of yours were not *Socinian* in the Doctrine of the *Trinity*? Might he not at another Time, tho' not then, appear againſt it? Might he not, tho' upon that Occaſion acquitted by the Biſhop, be afterwards, and upon other Occaſions, by other Judges, be found Guilty?

I will have nothing to ſay, at preſent, more particularly, concerning this Part of that Diſpute, than only to obſerve, Theſe Things upon it. That is very Viſible in it, how

how difficult a Thing it is to manage a Diſpute with a Man, who invents his own Terms, and who therefore can eaſily eſcape in, and out of, Them, as he pleaſes. Mr. *Lock* was ſo much a Maſter of the Art of Diſpute, that, He would never be fixed to any Meaning of his own Words, which it was inconvenient for him to own; how probable ſoever it was to others, that He intended it. He was ſo ſlippery a Writer, and had ſo many diſtinct Ideas, and Evaſions, that, He would acknowledge no Senſe in his Expreſſions, but That, which was unavoidably neceſſary. And ſuch a Method of Management will always render any Diſpute, difficult, and vexatious. But, it is notorious, that this is Mr. *Lock*'s Manner in all the Diſputes, in which He was concerned. And it is as Notorious, that He always treated his Adverſaries with ſo much Haughtineſs, and Scorn, and Sneer, and Inſolence of Language, that his Management of the Controverſy became much more grievous, and inſupportable, than any Clearneſs, or Strength of his Reas'ning; and That, they were obliged rather to drop, the Man, than his Arguments. And it is not impoſſible, but that This might be the State of the Diſpute, between the Biſhop of *Worceſter* and Him, notwithſtanding your Repreſentation of it. I know it was, generally, ſaid ſo, at the Time of their Writing. But, as I ſaid,

I will

I will make, at preſent, no further Enquiry into the Diſpute between them, becauſe it will be made with more Pertinence in another Place.

But I muſt obſerve to you again; That, what you Here labour, with ſo much Zeal, To clear Mr. *Lock* from *Socinian* Principles, will be nothing, in the leaſt, to Your Purpoſe; if He appears, in other Places of his Works, to be guilty of them,—and even in the Doctrine of the *Trinity*. And This is what I will now enquire into.

SECT. I.

Proofs, that Mr. Lock *was a* Socinian, *in This Doctrine, from the* Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity, *and the* two Vindications *of it.*

You know, that, your celebrated Friend was ſuppoſed, when he was alive, to be the Author of a Book, called The *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, and of *Two Vindications* of it; But, that He was ſo very reſerved in owning of Them, That He did not think fit publickly to confeſs them to be His, tho' He had ſev'ral Occaſions given Him to do it; Till his Death, and in his laſt Will.

(g) And theſe Treatiſes, it is well known, have been generally charged with many *Socinian* Principles, of the ſame Nature, with Thoſe mention'd above. And, it is well known, particularly, That Mr. *Edwards*, of *Cambridge*, did publickly, and in Print, charge the Book call'd the *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity* with *Socinianiſm*, and the Author of it, with being a *Socinian*. I will not undertake to defend or ſupport all that was ſaid by Mr. *Edwards*, but I cannot but obſerve, that Mr. *Lock*, in his Vindication of himſelf, in ſeveral Places, does not appear to be ſo much concern'd at that Imputation itſelf, as to contemn the ſuppoſed Guilt of it, and to defend and ſupport the Truth of His Doctrines. *(h)* You may pleaſe to conſult the Places cited in the Margin. Yet it muſt, at the ſame Time, be conteſt, That, Mr. *Lock* denies, That, He is a *Socinian*, or That He had borrowed from, or had read the *Racovians*. *(i)* But if his Doctrine be the ſame with theirs, of which every Man, upon comparing them together, is Judge, How can He notwithſtanding be free from the Charge? And How forcibly

---

(*g*) Mr. *Lock*'s Character in the Collection of his Pieces by *P. Maizeaux*.

(*h*) The Firſt Vind. of the Reaſ. of Chriſ. p. 22. 23. 2 Vind. *p.* 350.

(*i*) 1 Vind. *p.* 23.

is one led to think, That He could be no Stranger to the Opinions, whatever He was, to the Works of Thoſe Men.

HOWEVER, this is certain, that the great Points, which Mr. *Lock* undertakes to maintain, and defend, in thoſe Books, are theſe; That the Preaching, or Believing, that, *Jeſus* was the *Meſſiah*, was all that was taught, or believed, as neceſſary to make any Man a Chriſtian, who firſt acknowledged the One, Eternal God; That, This was the Word, and Goſpel preached by *Jeſus Chriſt* and his Apoſtles; That, the Belief, that *Jeſus* was the *Son of God*, was nothing more than This; and That, wherever the Expreſſion of, the *Son of God*, was uſed, in all thoſe Places, He cites, and in all others, in the Scripture, the Signification of it is, only, that *Jeſus* was the *Meſſiah*. I think, I may ſpare the Pains of being particular. The Proof of This ſeems to be the great Buſineſs of that whole Book, call'd the *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*. But if You pleaſe, You may take a View of ſome of the Paſſages, in the Margin, which make it undeniable. *(k)*

(k) *P.* 26, 27, 28, 29. *p.* 32, 33, 34, &c. *p.* 44, 45, 46. *p.* 52, 53, 54, &c.

Now, I will not, at preſent, do ſo much Wrong to the Richneſs of Mr. *Lock*'s Invention, or to his natural Inclination to ſtrike out new, and particular, Orthodoxies; as to ſuppoſe, That He borrowed theſe Notions, directly, from *Socinus*, or The *Leviathan*; Tho' He might have borrowed them from Either. Neither, will I enter, particularly, into the Examination of That Queſtion, Whether the Belief, that, *Jeſus* is the *Meſſiah*, be, All, that is required to be believ'd, to make a Man a Chriſtian, who admits before, That there is One, Eternal God. For there is no doubt, but that all Men are made Chriſtians, and muſt be ſav'd by Faith in *Chriſt*; That, He is the *Meſſiah*, the Saviour of Men; and This, at leaſt, all Chriſtians muſt agree in. Thus far Mr. *Lock* makes no new Diſcovery. But, I muſt have Leave to add; That, this Faith in *Chriſt*, that He is the *Meſſiah*, the Saviour of Men, implies ſev'ral diſtinct Propoſitions, as Mr. *Lock* himſelf acknowledges in ſev'ral Places; *(l)* And particularly, when *Jeſus* is ſaid to be the *Chriſt*, the *Son of God*, That, thoſe Words will be often found, to imply, not only, His Office of *Meſſiah*, but His Divine Nature alſo; and, to expreſs to us, That his Divine Nature is a part of

(l) 1 Vind. *p.* 28. 2 Vind. *p.* 25.

That

That Belief, which, in Mr. *Lock*'s Words, is neceſſary to make a Man a Chriſtian. What I ſhall inſiſt upon, againſt Mr. *Lock*, under this Head, is This. That, the Words, *Son of God*, ſignify, and mean, not only The *Meſſiah*, but alſo, the divine Nature of *Jeſus Chriſt*; That, it was the Opinion of the Jews, that Their *Meſſiah* was not only to be an Extraordinary Man, but a Divine Perſon; and That, This was propoſed to the Faith of Thoſe, who were made Chriſtians, in the Preachings of *Chriſt* himſelf, and his Apoſtles, as well as, and at the ſame Time with, the Kingly Power, and Authority, of the *Meſſiah*. And This, I doubt not, will clearly appear, if we diſtinctly conſider, the Uſe and Import of this Phraſe, *Son of God*, in thoſe Paſſages of the Evangeliſts, and Acts of the Apoſtles, where Mr. *Lock* has traced it.

But, here, I will not inſiſt, that the Phraſe, *Son of God*, muſt be *always* diſtinct from, and imply ſomething more, than the *Chriſt*; becauſe the One is often joyn'd with the Other Expreſſion in the ſame Sentence; The Diſtinction between them, I acknowledge, does not neceſſarily follow, from their being thus joyned in the ſame Period. Synonymous Words are, I confeſs, ſometimes ſo joyned, in Scripture. There is no Queſtion, but the Samaritans meant to con-

feſs the ſame Faith, when they ſaid (m) *We know that this is the Chriſt, the Saviour of the World*; and, That the High Prieſt and Scribes ſpoke in Synonymous Terms, when they ſaid (n) *Let Chriſt, the King of* Iſrael *deſcend now from the Croſs*; That the unbelieving *Jews* ſpake in Terms of the ſame Import, when they joyned together *Chriſt*, and the *Choſen of God*; (o) and that *Martha*'s Confeſſion, *I believe that thou art the Chriſt, the Son of God, which ſhould come into the World*, conſiſted of Three Prædicates, the Firſt and Laſt of which were certainly ſynonymous.

But there are other undenyable Proofs, That, *Chriſt*, or *Meſſiah*, and the *Son of God*, were very different Appellations, and generally implied different Things, when prædicated of *Jeſus*. It is plain in the Goſpels, that our Lord himſelf freely own'd, and declared, at all Times, and to all Perſons, that He was the *Son of God*, but with great Reſerve, if ever, to the unbelieving *Jews*, that He was the *Chriſt*. His Diſcourſes upon this Subject were ſo ambiguous, that the *Jews* expoſtulate with

(m) John 4. 42.
(n) Mark 15. 32.
(o) Luke 23. 35.

Him

Him (*p*) ſaying, *How long doſt thou make us to doubt? If thou be the Chriſt, tell us plainly.* And even then, his Anſwer was not direct, but related to his being the *Son of God* only. If theſe two Expreſſions, *Chriſt* and the *Son of God*, had been of equal Significations, What Reaſon can be given, why our Lord ſhould not have as freely ſpoken of Himſelf under one Character, as under the other? It is plain, He forbad his Diſciples to tell that He was *Jeſus the Chriſt.* (*q*) But though *Peter* had at the ſame Time confeſſed him to be *the Son of the living God*, He laid Them under no Obligation of concealing that Title. The ſame Prohibition our Saviour alſo laid upon the Devils, whom He caſt out. (*r*) *Unclean Spirits, when they ſaw Him, cried ſaying, Thou art the Son of God; And He ſtrictly charged them, that they ſhould not make Him known.* But this would have been in vain, if *Son of God*, and *Meſſiah*, had been Titles of the ſame Import; For then, Confeſſing him to be *Son of God*, would have diſcovered Him to be *Meſſiah*, as

(*p*) John 10. 24.
(*q*) Matth. 16. 20.
(*r*) Mark 3. 11, 12.

much as if they had called Him *The Chriſt* (*s*).

(*s*) And ſo indeed they expreſly term him, in the Parallel Place of St. *Luke* 4. 41. But that *Chriſt* was not, originally, in the Place, is evident, from the Context. For it immediately follows thereupon, *and He rebuking them, ſuffered them not to ſpeak; for they knew that He was the Chriſt.* But according to the preſent Text, it was too late to inhibit Them; For They had already ſpoke, what he deſired to have concealed, in confeſſing him to be *the Chriſt*. Again, if they had already own'd that Title of his, Why does the Evangeliſt add that Remark in the End of the Verſe? *And they knew him to be the Chriſt.* So that, as the Paſſage now ſtands, it will be very difficult to account for the Pertinence of this Obſervation. But if *Chriſt* be leſt out, as it is in St. *Mark*, the Whole appears eaſy and natural. When the Devils confeſs *Jeſus* to be *the Son of God*, He fearing their next Words would acknowledge him alſo to be the *Chriſt*, ſtops them ſhort, and ſuffers them to ſpeak no more. And that he had Reaſon in laying ſuch an Inhibition is juſtly obſerved by the Evangeliſt in what next follows, *For They knew that He was Chriſt.* And as the preſent Reading of ὁ Χριστὸς muſt needs be a Redundancy from what follows in the Verſe; So it is omitted by *Tertullian* and *Origen*, as alſo in the *Vulgar*, *Coptick*, and *Arabick*, Verſions, and in Three MSS of good Note. Vid. Millii Ed. N. T. This Paſſage, thus reſtored, is an additional Evidence for the diſtinct Senſe of *Meſſiah* or *Chriſt*, and *Son of God*; for beſides that, the Caution or Prohibition would have been in vain, if, in owning him to be *the Son of God*, They had already confeſt Him to be the *Meſſiah*, as they muſt have done, if *Meſſiah* and *Son of God* were Names denoting the ſame Office; ſo alſo the Evangeliſt's Remark, that the Devils *knew Jeſus to be the Chriſt* would have no Senſe or Pertinence, unleſs thoſe two Titles have a diſtinct Meaning. For if *the Son of God* was only another Name for *Chriſt*, the Devils, owning him to be the One, ſufficiently diſcover'd that they knew him to be the Other. And to remark ſo obvious a Thing, would ill become an ordinary Hiſtorian, much leſs one inſpired.

BUT let us proceed to conſider the Places of Scripture in Mr. *Lock*'s own Method. The Faith of the Apoſtles concerning the *Meſſiah* may be ſuppoſed to have been the Pattern of That, which was to be expected from all Chriſtians. And what That was, is plainly ſet down in the Goſpel. (*t*) When many of His Diſciples had left Him upon his ſaying that He was *the Bread from Heaven*, He ſaid to the Apoſtles, *Will ye alſo go away? Then* Simon Peter *anſwered him, ſaying, Lord, to whom ſhall we go? Thou haſt the Words of Eternal Life. And we believe, and are ſure, that thou art that Chriſt, the Son of the living God.* And we find, that it was upon the Confeſſion of This Faith, *that Jeſus was the Meſſiah, the Son of the living God*, that our Saviour ſaid, He would *build his Church*, and that, while it was built upon this *Rock, the Gates of Hell ſhould not be able to prevail againſt it*. (*u*) And as This was the Faith, which diſtinguiſhed the Apoſtles themſelves from Unbelievers; ſo One of them, St. *John*, tells us, for what End he wrote his Goſpel, in theſe Words, *That ye may believe, that Jeſus is the Meſſiah,*

(*t*) John 6. 68, 69.
(*u*) Matth. 16. 16, 18.

the

the Son of God, and that believing ye might have Life thro' his Name (w). And agreeable with this Faith is the Anſwer, which *Martha* makes to our Saviour's Diſcourſe concerning the Means of obtaining Eternal Life. *He that liveth, and believeth in me, ſhall not dye. Believeſt Thou this? She ſaith unto Him, Yea, Lord; I believe that Thou art the Chriſt, the Son of God, which ſhould come into the World* (x). And that This was the Faith, which the Apoſtles preached, is evident from the Profeſſion which the Eunuch made to *Philip*. *I believe, the Son of God to be Jeſus Chriſt*, For this is the Order of the Words in the Original (y). And the ſame was the Faith, alſo, of *Nathanael*, when He owned his Redeemer in theſe Words. *Thou art the Son of God, Thou art the King of* Iſrael. (z) The High Prieſt of the *Jews* alſo, to ſhew what Their Belief was concerning the Perſon of the *Meſſiah*, demands of our Saviour, *Art Thou the Chriſt, the Son of the Bleſſed!* (a) And the *Jews* themſelves, *Art Thou the Chriſt?* To which Queſtion He an-

(w) John 20. 30, 31.
(x) John 11. 26, 27.
(y) Act. 8. 37. Πιστεύω τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι τὸν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν.
(z) John 1. 49.
(a) Mark 14. 61.

ſwer'd

ſwer'd not. *Art Thou the Son of God?* To which He ſaid, *Ye ſay that I am.* (*b*) So alſo, when They urged *Pilate* to put Him to Death, They told him, *We have a Law, and by our Law he ought to dye, becauſe he made Himſelf the Son of God.* (*c*) And when the High Prieſt mocked Him, while He was upon the Croſs, beſides His being the *King of* Iſrael, they derided him for having ſaid, *I am the Son of God.* (*d*) And the aſtoniſhed Centurion very probably thought him a Divine Perſon, when ſeeing the *Earthquake, and thoſe Things, that were done, He feared greatly, ſaying, truly This was the Son of God* (e); As the famed Aſtronomer, at the unnatural Darkneſs, which happened at His Crucifixion, had done in another Place (f).

THIS was the Faith alſo, which St. *Paul* preached after his own Miraculous Converſion; ſo His own Hiſtorian aſſures us, *Straitway he preached Chriſt in the Synagogues, that He is the Son of God* (g).

(*b*) Luke 22. 67, 70.
(*c*) John 19. 7.
(*d*) Matth. 27. 42, 43.
(*e*) Matth. 27. 54.
(*f*) Suidas in Διονυσίω — Ἢ τὸ θεῖον πάσχει, ἢ τῷ πάσχοντι συμπάσχει.
(*g*) Acts 9. 20.

In all theſe Places of Scripture, it is obvious, that *Son of God*, and *Meſſiah* are diſtinguiſht, and imply different Things, when prædicated of our Lord; and That the *Jews* themſelves, and their High Prieſts, in our Lord's Time, thought there was a wide Difference between thoſe Two Titles. When *Jeſus* appropriated that of *Son of God* to himſelf, we find, that They ſtill charged Him with Blaſphemy, whilſt the worſt Conſtruction They could put, on his being call'd the *Chriſt*, or *Meſſiah*, was only Sedition, or Treaſon. Which Diſtinction They could not have been inclined to make, if They had apprehended, that *Meſſiah*, and, *Son of God*, were Names, implying the ſame Thing: Becauſe it would, then, have been Treaſon, in the Conſtruction of the *Jews*, for *Jeſus* to have made Himſelf the *Son of God*, on the one Hand; and on the other, it would have been imputed to Him, as Blaſphemy, in the conſequence of ſuch an Interpretation, to have aſſumed to himſelf the Title, of *the Chriſt*. Neither of which, in Fact, ever happen'd. And therefore, I think, I may ſafely ſay it is evident, that *Meſſiah*, and *Son of God*, were Titles generally very different, when applied to our Lord, and that the *Latter* ſignified an Addition, of *Divine Nature*, to the Faith of the *Former*.

But

But before I proceed to examine the Paſſages diſtinctly, I beg leave to obſerve, further, along with Mr. *Lock*, how the Evangeliſts deliver to us this Faith, and in what Expreſſions. *John*, bearing Witneſs to Him, who *baptized with the Holy Ghoſt*, or *the Meſſiah*, ſays, *I ſaw, and bear Record, that This is the Son of God* (h). This was alſo the Declaration of Him, made at His Baptiſm, by the Voice of God himſelf, from Heaven. *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleaſed* (i). And the Devils themſelves made this Confeſſion of Him, when They came out of many, crying (as the Text is truly ſtated) *Thou art the Son of God* (k). Or as it is related by St. *Mark*, *Unclean Spirits when they ſaw him, fell down before Him, and cry'd Thou art the Son of God* (l).

From theſe Places of the Evangeliſts, I proceed to ſee, what our Saviour himſelf taught the World, and required Men to believe of Him. When He appeared in the Temple of *Jeruſalem*, and drove the Tra-

(*h*) John 1. 34.
(*i*) Matth. 3. 17.
(*k*) Luke 4. 41.
(*l*) Mark 3. 11, 12.

ders

ders out of it; He ſaid to them, *Make not my Father's Houſe an Houſe of Merchandice, (m)* plainly implying that He was the *Son of God.* And This therefore, was what He conſtantly ſpake, and taught of Himſelf, calling *God his Father.* So He ſays, *Whoſoever will confeſs me, before Men, Him will I confeſs before my Father, which is in Heaven. (n)* And ſo He tells His Mother, when She expoſtulated with Him, for leaving *Joſeph*, and Her, while He tarried behind them at *Jeruſalem. Wiſt You not that I muſt be about my Father's Buſineſs?* (o) So He tells the Jews, *My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.* (p) By which Words of His, the Jews themſelves thought, He aſcribed Divinity to Himſelf. For it is immediately added; *Therefore the Jews ſought the more to kill Him, becauſe He ſaid alſo, that God was His Father, making himſelf equal with God.* Yet we find Him again repeating This, very often, to the ſame unbelieving People. *My Father is greater than all——I and My Father are one. Then the Jews took up Stones again to ſtone Him; Jeſus anſwered them, Many good Works have I ſhew'd You from*

(m) John 2. 16.
(n) Matth. 10. 32.
(o) Luke 2. 49.
(p) John 5. 17, 18.

My

My Father; For which of thoſe good Works do You ſtone Me? The Jews anſwer'd Him, ſaying, For a good Work we ſtone Thee not, but for Blaſphemy, and becauſe that Thou, being a Man, makeſt Thyſelf God. (q) Theſe are our Lord's own Preachings concerning Himſelf; And They are what He requir'd the World to believe of Him. And we may ſee alſo from Them, What Opinion the Jews had of the Perſon of *the Meſſiah*; That God was to be His Father; and That He was to be in an Equality with God; And we may obſerve further, That there can be no juſt, and ſufficient, Reaſon given, why God ſhould ſo often, in the New Teſtament, be mention'd, under the Name of Father, which was, ſeldom, or never, aſcribed to Him, in the Old, but only This, That, He was the Father of our Lord *Jeſus Chriſt*.

I wave the Account we have of our Saviour's Preaching, What it was, and how far agreeable to this Faith. It may be ſufficient to obſerve under this Head, That to ſhew for ever, What was the ſtanding Faith, which ſhould be required of, and taught all Nations, who ſubmitted themſelves to the Kingdom of *the Meſſiah*, He left This His

(q) John 10. 32, 33.

laſt,

laſt, and great, Commiſſion, to His Apoſtles, and their Succeſſours, *Go and Diſciple all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt.* (r) In which Words, 'tis undenyable, that the Faith, or Belief, of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt was left, for ever, to be the neceſſary Terms, by which all Men ſhould be made Chriſtians. And there can be no Queſtion, but That the Apoſtles obey'd the Orders, which This Commiſſion gave them. And we know, that Obedience has been paid to it in the Chriſtian Church, ever ſince.

Now, from all theſe Texts, thus laid together, in Mr. *Lock*'s own Method, and Manner, what I contend for is This. That the Divine Nature of *Jeſus Chriſt* was taught, and required to be believ'd by them, who receiv'd Him for the *Meſſiah*; That, That Expreſſion in Them, the *Son of God*, ſignifies the Divine Nature of the *Meſſiah*; and That Mr. *Lock* has not made the Contrary ſufficiently appear. *Son of God*, manifeſtly contains an undenyable Relation to that Father, of whom our Saviour ſo often ſpeaks. *Son of God* cannot be Synonymous with the *Meſſiah*, and import no more than

(r) Matth. 28. 19.

that

that Word, becauſe it has been, already, clearly prov'd, to be diſtinguiſht from it. And what is once clearly prov'd, to be diſtinguiſhed from it, may always be preſum'd to be ſo, where there is no clear Reaſon to the contrary. I know Mr. *Lock* pretends, That in ſome Paſſages, where *Son of God* is diſtinguiſhed from, by being directly predicated of, *Chriſt or the Meſſiah*, particularly, in thoſe Words ſpoken of *St. Paul's* Preaching, *Straitway he preached Chriſt in the Synagogues, that He is the Son of God*, (*s*) "There the Word *Chriſt* is only a pro-"per Name:" But that He ſhould make this good, in the Places cited, is impoſſible; It is a mean and low Evaſion, it was neceſſary for Him to ſay ſo, to ſupport His own Doctrine, and to force his Senſe upon the Paſſages of Scripture; And the Aſſertion is falſe and ridiculous. Our Saviour himſelf, it is manifeſt, made a Diſtinction between *Meſſiah*, and *Son of God*, For being asked by the chief Prieſts *Art Thou the Chriſt? Art Thou the Son of God?* He declines ſaying that He was *the Chriſt*, but owns Himſelf to be the *Son of God*. (*t*) And No queſtion, He did not diſtinguiſh, without a Difference.

(*s*) Acts 9. 20.
(*t*) Luke 22. 67, 70.

I will beg Leave to obſerve alſo one Thing further, That our Saviour, in Several Places of the Evangeliſts, calls Himſelf the *Son of Man*. (*u*) And I believe it will not be queſtioned, but that, This Expreſſion ſignifies the *Meſſiah*. But, Is there then no difference, between the Meaning of theſe Two Expreſſions, *Son of God, and Son of Man*, tho' both applied to the ſame Perſon, *the Meſſiah?* I appeal to any Chriſtian Man to determine, whether of the Two has the moſt exalted and divine Senſe? And if the Words, *Son of God*, cannot ſignify the ſame with *Son of Man*, nor barely the ſame with *Meſſiah*; They ſignify His Divine Nature. And if they ſignify his Divine Nature, then the Divine Nature of *Meſſiah* was alſo a Part of that Faith, which was neceſſary to make Men Chriſtians. And if the Divine Nature of *Jeſus Chriſt* be a Part of that Faith, which is neceſſary to make Men Chriſtians, Then a Man, who endeavours to perſuade the World, that it is not neceſſary, may be ſuppoſed to deny it. And to deny the Divine Nature of *Jeſus Chriſt* is *Socinianiſm*, in the Doctrine of the *Trinity*. And for theſe Reaſons therefore, Mr. *Lock* may be juſtly charged with it, in theſe His Writings.

(*u*) Matth. 8. 20. 9, 6. Luke 5. 24. John 1, 51. 3. 13, &c.

I know

I know, that Mr. *Lock* makes ſeveral Exceptions, againſt the Application of many of the Paſſages of Scripture, here brought, to prove, that the Words, *Son of God*, ſignify the Divine Nature of the *Meſſiah*, and that the Belief of this Divine Nature is neceſſary to make Men Chriſtians. But as his Exceptions ſhew Him, more particularly, to have been *Socinian*: So They are eaſily capable of being anſwered; And therefore I ſhall ſpend ſome little Time upon Them.

And Here, I cannot but obſerve, Firſt in general, That, while Mr. *Lock* ſeems to avoid the Imputation of *Socinianiſm*, He generally falls into the Senſe, and Interpretations of that Set of Men. He owns He underſtands many Places of Scripture, as They do. Particularly He ſays, "What ap-
"pears to me to be the true Meaning of
"Scripture, I ſhall not decline, becauſe I
"am told, that it is ſo underſtood by the
"*Racovians*." (*w*) And further, "That
"He will not diſown the Senſe, He puts on
"that Phraſe, the *Son of God*, tho' the *So-*
"*cinians* underſtood it in the ſame." (*x*) This ſeems to have been one of Mr. *Lock*'s

(*w*) 1 Vind. *p.* 22.
(*x*) P. 23. of the ſame.

Particularities. He would enjoy the Opinion, but diſown the bad Company, which He acceded to, by it; He would hold the diſtinguiſhing Doctrine of the *Socinians*, and yet, ſometimes pretend, in great Innocence, to know Nothing of it, that it was Theirs; or if He did, would not be nam'd amongſt Them. He thinks it, in the Place laſt above cited, hard upon Him, to be thought a *Socinian*, for following the *Socinian* Opinion in one Point. "And therefore, ſays He, I "muſt certainly be of their Perſuaſion, in "every Thing elſe." No, This is not neceſſarily to be inferred, however true it may be; But ſo much is certain, and neceſſary, That He, that joins with the *Socinians*, in Their great, and diſtinguiſhing Doctrines, may be juſtly call'd a *Socinian*, tho' He does not acknowledge all Their Errors. As a Man would be a *Mahometan*, who believ'd in *Mahomet*, tho' He did not receive into his Faith all the Errors of the *Alcoran*. And, as a Man, who holds Heretical Opinions, is certainly an Heretick, with regard only, to the Quality, and not to the Number, of His Errors. And when a Man is firmly engaged in the Defence, or Advancement of Heretical Opinions, it is not Popular Names, or great Authorities, not Biſhop *Taylor*, nor Arch-Biſhop *Tillotſon*, nor Biſhop *Patrick*, (Authorities cited by Mr. *Lock*,) which can ſcreen Him from the ill Repu-

Reputation of Them; if They were Men, who were otherwiſe unexceptionable for the Truth of their Opinions themſelves; Whereas, of Theſe, Biſhop *Taylor* was known to have had many ſingular and falſe Opinions; Whereas, Arch-Biſhop *Tillotſon* was not free from the Charge of being a *Socinian*. And if the Authority of Men of Figure, and Station, in the Church, is not ſufficient Defence for Hereſy; Much leſs will it be thought ſuch, That, a Perſon, under the Power of Error, ſhould be capable of thinking, as Mr. *Lock* ſometimes does, "That "His Own Opinion is the Plainneſs, and "Simplicity of the Goſpel. (*y*) That He "can laugh at Orthodoxy, becauſe all Sects "pretend to it; while He ſuppoſes Himſelf, "only, to be Maſter of the Truth, (*z*) "That he can perpetually rail at Creed-"Makers; while He himſelf is making a "Creed. (*a*) That, He can renounce and "ſcorn all Popular Authorities; (*b*) while "He himſelf is impoſing his own. (*c*) That "He can ſay, I will call no Man Maſter "upon Earth, no Man ſhall magiſterially "impoſe his Interpretations, or Opinions,

(*y*) 1 Vind. *p.* 13.
(*z*) 2 Vind. *p.* 380.
(*a*) 1 Vind. *p.* 28. 2 Vind. *p.* 230.
(*b*) 1 Vind. *p.* 23.
(*c*) 2 Vind. *p.* 93.

" on Me; (*d*) while He himſelf is inſolent-
" ly dictating to others. That He will
" take no Notice of the Authority, and Ge-
" neral Conſent, of the Chriſtian Church,
" in interpreting Scriptures; While He him-
" ſelf interprets againſt Them. That He
" has ſo mean, and vile an Opinion, of the
" Catholick Church, as to conſider it, on-
" ly, as a Combination of Sects, in which
" every Leader, tho' they allow their Fol-
" lowers to read the Scriptures, yet chuſe
" a Set of Principles for them, to be em-
" braced, and to which the Scriptures are
" to be brought;" (*e*) While He himſelf is compoſing a Book, by which He intends to gather Followers after Him, " Of Men, not " yet throughly Chriſtians," (*f*) upon Principles not throughly Chriſtian, and acknowledged by himſelf, in common, with a Set of Men, not throughly Chriſtians. So that, whatever Mr. *Lock* has, in this manner, ſaid for Himſelf, or whatever may be ſaid for Him, by Others, if his Opinions were *Socinian*, the Imputation of *Socinianiſm* muſt, and will, follow Him. As will appear, if we conſider,

(*d*) 2 Vind. *p.* 345.
(*e*) 2 Vind. *p.* 260, 270.
(*f*) 1 Vind. *p.* 6.

In the Second Place, His Particular Interpretation of ſome of the Texts before-mention'd. And I ſhall take Them, in the Order, in which They have been cited. Mr. *Lock* obſerves, upon the Profeſſion of Faith made by the Eunuch, *I believe that Jeſus Chriſt is the Son of God.* (*g*) "That, thoſe "Words are, by ſome, ſuppoſed to include "that Chriſt was God, whereas to me, ſays "He, They appear to be meant, in this "Senſe, that, *Jeſus is the Meſſiah.*" (*h*) And He gives ſome Reaſons, why He prefers his own Senſe, in another Place. (*i*) The Literal Tranſlation, exactly conformed to the Original, is This, *I believe the Son of God to be Jeſus, the Chriſt.* This, He ſays, "inverts the Propoſition, and makes what "is uſually affirmed of *Jeſus of Nazareth* "to be affirmed of the *Son of God.* As if, "ſays He, the Eunuch knew, that the *Son "of God* ſignify'd God; Which, He thinks, "is not natural to be conceived." But who can help it, if St. *Luke* himſelf, in the Original Order of the Words, be againſt Him? It is the natural Order of Words, which ought to direct Interpretation. There is no Inconſiſtency, in ſuppoſing, that, the Eunuch was inſtructed, that *Son of God* ſignified God.

(*g*) Acts 8. 37.
(*h*) 2 Vind. *p.* 104.
(*i*) 2 Vind. *p.* 173, 174.

And what it was natural for Mr. *Lock* to conceive, is not worth enquiring in this Place. But allowing the Words the Place, which They have, in the *Engliſh* Tranſlation, He then finds Himſelf entangled in a Tautology, which gives our Lord two diſtinct Titles ſucceſſively, implying both the ſame Thing, If *Son of God* ſignified nothing different from the *Meſſiah*. And He ſays, "This will be quite removed, if we take "*Chriſt*, here, for a Proper Name, as He "ſuppoſes it is uſed in other Places, as *Acts* "iii. 6, 4, 10. eſpecially where the Words "are, *In, and by, the Name of Jeſus Chriſt* "*of Nazareth.*" Becauſe Mr. *Lock* apprehends, that if *Chriſt* ſignified the Perſonal Dignity, or Office of *the Meſſiah*, the Word *Nazareth* would bring an inconvenient Relation upon it, as it ſtands in the Text. But This is ſure a poor Expedient, ſince common Senſe, in this Place, will allow the Pauſe of a Comma between Them; And That, the Word *Chriſt* is any where uſed as a Proper Name, in the other Places, which He mentions, it is ſufficient only to deny. That the Name of *Chriſtians* was given to the Followers of *Chriſt*, is certainly no Argument, that it was derived from *Chriſt*, only, as a Proper Name. It may be preſum'd, that the Firſt Chriſtians thought it a greater Honour to be called by the Kingly Style of their Lord; and with That

View

View gave themſelves That Name: And in what Manner, *Agrippa*, or the *Roman* Hiſtorians, uſed, or applied the Words *Chriſt*, or *Chriſtians*, it is not in the leaſt to the Purpoſe to enquire.

FURTHER, Mr. *Lock* alſo, occaſionally, obſerves, that when the *Jews* accuſed *Chriſt* to *Pilate* in thoſe Words, *We have a Law, and by our Law He ought to dye, becauſe He made himſelf the Son of God* (k). That, there was No other Law but That againſt falſe Prophets, *Deut.* 18. 20 whereby making himſelf, *The Son of God*, deſerved Death (*l*). But this is certainly falſe. For the *Jews* had, ſeveral Times, charged Him with Blaſphemy; and had Themſelves endeavoured to put Him to Death, for it (*m*). And particularly, the High Prieſt, after He had adjured Him to tell, whether He was the *Son of God*, upon His Anſwer, accuſed Him of Blaſphemy, (*n*) and by the Law againſt Blaſphemy (*o*) He was to dye, if guilty; and His affirming Himſelf to be the *Son of God* was His Guilt; And that, *God was His*

(*k*) John 19. 7.
(*l*) Reaſ. Chriſt. *p.* 152.
(*m*) John 8. 59. — 10. 33.
(*n*) Matth. 26. 61.
(*o*) Lev. 24. 16.

Father;

Father, making Himſelf, as we are told the *Jews* underſtood it, *equal with God*. And This was that Law of Theirs, by which They thought, He ought to dye (*p*). So that, it is plain, that the *Jews* looked upon our Saviour to be ſomething more than a falſe Prophet, when He ſaid, that He was *the Son of God*, ſuppoſing, that thereby He claimed Divine Honours to Himſelf.

In the ſame Manner alſo, Mr. *Lock*, in another Place (*q*) ſays, That ἐγὼ εἰμι implies no More than ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ χριςὸς, *I am the Chriſt*, citing Three ſeveral Places for it (*r*). But there is One Place, which He conſidered not, where the Word, χριςὸς, cannot be ſupplied. And that is, where our Lord tells the *Jews*, *Verily, verily, I ſay unto You, before* Abraham *was, I am* (s). Here the Words, ἐγὼ εἰμι, are evidently to be underſtood, without Relation to *the Meſſiah*, and ſignify the ſame, as if our Lord had called himſelf, The ὁ ὢν, The *Jehovah*, who ſaid, *I am, that I am* (t). And ſo, it is manifeſt, the *Jews*

(*p*) John 10. 33.
(*q*) Reaſ. Chriſt. *p.* 171.
(*r*) John 13. 19. Luke 21. 8. Matth. 24. 5.
(*s*) John 8. 58.
(*t*) Exod. 3. 14.

under-

underſtood our Saviour to have meant, in this Place; For it is added, Immediately, *They took up Stones to caſt at Him*, in Puniſhment, as they ſuppoſed, of His Blaſphemy. Mr. *Lock*, no doubt, ſaw theſe Texts ſtand in His Way againſt Him, and implying the Divinity of the *Meſſiah*; And therefore, tho' He was upon another Purſuit, in the Places, where He ſpeaks to Them, He thought it worth His While, as it were, *en paſſant*, to ſubdue Them to Himſelf; but with How little Force and Reaſon, is manifeſt.

AGAIN, Mr. *Lock* ſuppoſes, that the Voice from Heaven which ſaid, *Thou art my Beloved Son, in whom I am well pleaſed*, (u) ſignified no more, than that, *Jeſus* was the *Meſſiah*. But it is to be conſidered, that Mr. *Lock* brings no Reaſon to ſupport this Suppoſition; But only, that, He lays it down before, That, *Son of God*, every where ſignifies *Meſſiah*, which, I hope, I have, by this Time, made appear not to be true; And there can be no Reaſon to allow more Authority to Him, in recommending a Prejudiced, Unſupported, Interpretation of any Paſſage of Scripture, than to any other Man. And

(u) Matth. 3. 17.

much

much leſs, when it can be ſaid, That this Place of Scripture has generally, by the Ancient Church, been underſtood to have been a Proof of our Saviour's Divine Nature (*w*). Such an Authority is the greateſt and beſt, that can be appeal'd to, and the moſt proper to direct us how to underſtand the Scriptures; And it will always weigh ſuch a One, as Mr. *Lock*, out of Sight, how mean ſoever His Opinion may be of That *Venerable Mob*. But beſides, as God was pleaſed, by that Voice, to ſignify Himſelf to be a Father; ſo His beloved Son aſſures us, that *He had a Glory with the Father, before the World was* (x). And in conſequence, the Relation between this Father and Son muſt have exiſted, infinitely, before the Kingdom of the *Meſſiah;* which is all the Foundation Mr. *Lock* finds for the Style of *Son of God*. But, *Son of God* is a Title, at laſt, grown ſo mean with Mr. *Lock*, that He ſuppoſes, that, *Adam* was call'd ſo (*y*),

(*w*) Tertullianus Ed. Rigalt. & Lutet. 1641. Adver. Praxeam P. 650.
Cyrillus Ed. Oxon. Cat. 11. p. 139.
——— Cat. 10. p. 133.
Auguſtinus Ed. Frob. Fol. 1528. Ench. ad Laurent. p. 119. B. Tom. 3.
——— De Mirab. S. p. 536. D. To. 3.
Chryſoſt. in loc.
(x) John 17. 5.
(*y*) Luke 3. 38.

by

by as juſt a Title as the *Only Begotten of the Father, by whom all Things were made* (z). His only Reaſon, to ſupport this extravagant Suppoſition, is, That, They both received Immortality from God their Father; *Adam* being created in a State of Immortality, the Image and Likeneſs of God; And our Saviour, ſaying of Himſelf, That *the Father hath given to the Son to have Life in Himſelf.* (*a*) And ſo, Both having equally received the Image, and Likeneſs of God; Both, to Mr. *Lock*, are equally his Sons. But with what Conſiſtency, *Adam* can be equally a Son with the *only Begotten of the Father*, Or how equally poſſeſs'd of Immortality with Him, *who was in the Beginning with God*, and who made *Adam, and all Things, that were made*; let Mr. *Lock*'s Friends conſider, and if They can, let Them acquit Him from being *Socinian* in this Place.

Again, When the Devils, that were caſt out by our Saviour, confeſs'd, that He was the *Son of God*, Mr. *Lock*, to apply their Confeſſion to his own Purpoſe, asks, Can it be imagined, that thoſe Unclean Spirits had a Mind to acknowledge, and publiſh

(z) Reaſ. Chriſt. p. 202, 203.
(*a*) John 5. 26.

the

the Deity of our Saviour? (*b*) I anſwer, No. Nor that *Jeſus* was the *Meſſiah* neither. It was as little Their Intereſt to publiſh, That the Kingdom of the *Meſſiah* was come, as to declare that the *Meſſiah* was a divine Perſon. Their Confeſſion, no doubt, was extorted from Them, and They trembled at His Power, while They obey'd it. So that, *Son of God* in their Mouths muſt have had the ſame Signification, as it had when ſpoken either by God, or Man, and the ſame which I am now contending for, as hath been proved already.

AGAIN, Mr. *Lock*, in Defence of the Senſe he hath put upon thoſe Words, *Son of God*, ſays, That *Son of God* could ſignify nothing elſe, but *the Meſſiah*, appears, from the Perſons that uſed it, who were, *Jews*, and Heathens, Men, and Women, Believers, and Unbelievers; To which I anſwer, that I have already made it appear, that both Friends, and Enemies, ſufficiently underſtood the Meaning of that Phraſe; That our Saviour's Diſciples and Followers aſcribed it to him, as an Acknowledgment, that He was a Divine Perſon; That, His Enemies denyed it to Him,

(*b*) 2 Vind. p. 361.

as

as thinking it Blaſphemy to give Him that Honour: But that All, that uſed it, apprehended, that the Perſon, to whom it was applied, ought to be Divine.

Once more, Mr. *Lock* obſerves, upon thoſe Words of our Saviour to *Philip*, (c) *He that has ſeen me, hath ſeen the Father* —— *Believeſt Thou not, that I am in the Father, and the Father in me?* That, by being *in the Father, and the Father in him*, he ſignifies ſuch an Union with God, that God operates in, and by, Him; which is an Union only of Operation, or Power. But, That, This Union alone was not all, that our Saviour intended, in this Place, ſeems to be plain from the Words which follow, *Believe me, that I am in the Father, and the Father in Me, or elſe believe me, for the very Works ſake* (d). For, here, He manifeſtly requires his Diſciples to believe, that He was ſo intimately united with God the Father, that They mutually exiſted in one another; Or elſe, that If They did not believe This, They would Yet acknowledge His Works, as an Argument of His Union with God, the Father. His Works

(c) John 14. 9, 10.
(d) — v. 11.

were

were the Operations of Divine Power; and what was the Operation of a Divine Power, was the Effect of His Union with God; and not that Union itſelf. We may imagine that it was difficult for *Philip*, and the reſt of the Apoſtles to conceive, how by ſeeing their Maſter, They could have been ſaid to have ſeen God, the Father, as our Lord tells them They had, *He that hath ſeen me, hath ſeen the Father:* And that it was difficult for Them to apprehend, how *He could be in the Father, and the Father in Him;* and therefore, He refers Them to the Conſideration of His Miracles, That, from Thoſe viſible Effects of Divine Power, which the *Son of God* operated before Them, They might be led to acknowledge, that There muſt be an intimate Union between Him, and God the Father. And therefore, that They, that had ſeen Him, had ſeen a Perſon, who was in the moſt intimate Union with God the Father.

I ſhall at preſent follow Mr. *Lock*'s Interpretations of Scripture, in theſe His Books, no further. It is ſufficient to my Purpoſe, that I have made it appear, that They are falſe, and *Socinian*; And conſequently, that I did Him no Injury, when I call'd Him a *Socinian* Writer. Indeed it would be very difficult for any Man, who is not under very

ry partial Engagements to the Memory of Mr. *Lock*, to read over That Book of His, call'd *the Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, with the *Two Vindications* of it, and not to ſee, that it is entirely His Deſign, in all of Them, to deſtroy all Proof of the Divine Nature of our Saviour, in the four Evangeliſts, and in the Acts of the Apoſtles. And This, no doubt, was very agreable to the Deſign, which He owns that He had, of laying together a ſummary View of Chriſtianity, for the uſe of Deiſts, or Men not throughly Chriſtians. And ſuch Men perhaps as came into it, might be Chriſtians, as far as He Himſelf was, or as He deſired others ſhould be. But ſure no Age of Chriſtianity ever own'd ſuch a Faith ſufficient to make a Man a Chriſtian; Nor I hope ever will. Our Lord Himſelf hath fixed for ever the Terms, upon which we are to be Made Chriſtians, in that Commiſſion, which He left to his Apoſtles, and according to which all Nations have been made, and baptized His Diſciples, in the Faith or Belief of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt. And whatever Set of Chriſtians depart from This Faith, are evidently not ſuch, as *Jeſus Chriſt* commanded Them to be. Mr. *Lock* therefore, it is evident, widens the Pale of Chriſtian Communion, further, than He has Authority to do. And however, He might think, that, His Scheme

might be capable of encreaſing the Numbers, it is certain, that, it appears calculated to diminiſh, and debate, the Faith of Chriſtians. For tho', Mr. *Lock* would have us to ſuppoſe that His Book was intended, chiefly for Them, who were not yet thoroughly Chriſtians; And That, for their Sakes, He had not conſidered Chriſtianity in ſo general a Manner, as to wave all the doubtful Diſputations, which belonged to it; Yet this is clear, That if a Man is made a Chriſtian by believing Mr. *Lock*'s Summary or Creed only; Then the moſt thorough Chriſtian may be ſuch, by believing His Summary or Creed only; And ſo, His Book may be equally applied to the Service of a Man, that is, and of a Man, that is not, thoroughly a Chriſtian. And Then, We have here ſuch a Wide Comprehenſive Syſtem of Chriſtian Religion, as would ſwallow up, at once, all Diſputes, about Fundamentals, and encloſe in it all the different Sects of Chriſtians, that ever were, or ſhall be, to the World's End. Which is ſuch a wild Imagination, as one would not have expected from the ſober, and clear Reaſoning of Mr. *Lock*. I will allow with Mr. *Lock*, that there are ſeveral Sects of Chriſtians, who faſhion to themſelves ſeveral different Sets of fundamental Articles of Faith: And require more now, as neceſſary to be believed to make a Man a Chriſtian, than was at Firſt required by our Saviour

and his Apoſtles. (*e*) But, What then? Will this be a ſufficient Reaſon, for any Man to run into the contrary Extreme; to take away ſome of the known Fundamentals of Faith; and to require leſs to be believed, than was required to be believed by our Saviour and His Apoſtles, to make a Man a Chriſtian? This Mr. *Lock* has done. And therefore, let Him declaim, as much, and as warmly, as He pleaſes, "againſt the Hu-
"mours, Intereſts, or Deſigns, the Ortho-
"doxies, Fundamentals, and Syſtems, of the
"ſeveral Sects of Chriſtians; It is plain,
"He is very far from ſtriking out of the
"ſame old Road Himſelf; and That, He,
"in his Turn, is as ready, with his Set of
"Fundamentals, His Summary, or Syſtem;
"As impatient of Contradiction; and as
"willing, therefore, to impoſe them upon
"others, as He complains, others have done
"before Him." (*f*) And ſo it will always be, while Chriſtians aſſume to themſelves a Power of declaring Fundamentals, without attending enough to the perpetual Reception, and Interpretation, of the Catholick Church, and what Doctrines were always admitted as Fundamental in it. Private Men, Heads of Parties, and Sects of Chri-

(*e*) 2 Vind. *p.* 215.
(*f*) 2 Vind.

ſtians, may be under many Temptations of Enlarging, or Narrowing their diſtinct Syſtems of Fundamentals; But it will be impoſſible to ſay, or think, This, of All the Succeſſions of Chriſtians, from the Beginning of Chriſtianity, in the Catholick Church. And therefore, in every Enquiry into Fundamentals, Regard muſt be had to Them, and to Their Interpretations of Scripture. We muſt enquire what Doctrines were always received by Them, as Fundamental, and our Faith muſt be guided, Firſt, by the Scriptures, and Then, by their Faith alſo. For, there are no new Diſcoveries to be made, in the Chriſtian Religion. There is no Room left for Human Wit, and Invention; in Matters of Faith. That, which was from the Beginning, which always obtain'd, and has ſtood firm, from the Times of *Chriſt*, and His Apoſtles, is the only Truth and Faith; and Chriſtians are in the higheſt Manner obliged not to vary, or depart from it. In Philoſophy, and Studies of Human Invention, it is a Noble Exerciſe of Wit, and Reaſon, to endeavour to ſtrike out new Light, and to make Diſcoveries, in order to promote the Peace, and Happineſs of Mankind. In this Province, Mr. *Lock* perhaps, is by none denyed to have been very eminent. His Genius fitted Him to diſcover moſt of the Perfections and Imperfections of the Human Mind. And His Head was

excellently form'd for Abſtracted Thinking. But all This Penetration, and Search after new Things, is loſt, or vainly employed, in the Chriſtian Religion. Thoſe Things, which were Matters of Faith once, will be always ſuch; and Thoſe which were never Matters of Faith, will be never ſuch. Here therefore Mr. *Lock*'s enterprizing Genius was entirely wrong applied. He ſet out with the Vanity of a Philoſopher to interpret Scripture, and ſettle Articles of Faith. He informs the Chriſtian World, that They are more Chriſtians than They need to be; and inſults the Miniſters of the Chriſtian Religion, that He may give the greater Scope, and Freedom, to his own Inventions, and Interpretations. And therefore, You may declaim, as long as You pleaſe, that in Chriſtian Prudence, and Charity, ſuch a Man as Mr. *Lock* ought not to be given up for an Heretick, or *Socinian*. For if He choſe, with all His Acuteneſs, and Learning about Him, to Countenance and Defend ſuch Opinions, Who can help it? Who can anſwer for the vain, conceited Judgments, which Learned, but Prejudiced Men ſometimes make, in Religion? How ridiculous is it to think, that an acute Philoſopher muſt, of Courſe, be a true Believer, and an exact Interpreter of the Scriptures? Mr. *Lock* was never given up to the Adverſaries of the Chriſtian Faith; but He went

to them Himſelf, as we have now ſeen, particularly; And therefore no Prudence, or Charity in You, or Me, or any One elſe, can now ever recover Him.

SECT. II.

Proofs, from His Notes, and Paraphraſe upon the Epiſtles of St. Paul.

I Should now, therefore, leave Mr. *Lock*, as ſufficiently convicted of *Socinian* Principles, in the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, from theſe His Books; if He had not left us other Writings, alſo, His *Notes*, and *Paraphraſe upon ſome of the Epiſtles of St. Paul*, in which He appears to be tinctured with the ſame Hereſy. I ſhall cite and examine Two or Three Paſſages.

In His *Notes and Paraphraſe* upon the 1 Corinth. 8. 6. Where the Text ſtands thus. *But to us, there is but one God the Father, of Whom are all Things, and we in him; And one Lord Jeſus Chriſt, by Whom are all Things, and we by him.* Upon the latter Part of the Verſe, He is pleaſed in His Notes, to Paraphraſe in this Manner. "And "one Lord Agent Jeſus Chriſt, by whom "are all Things, that come from the Father "to us, and thro' whom alone, we find "Acceſs to Him." Here it is Manifeſt, that,

that, His bold Explication of εἷς κύριος, by one *Lord Agent*, ſignifies, that, our Bleſſed Saviour was *Lord*, only by Reaſon of his *Agency*, which being only Finite, and Deputed, that is, limited to the Kingdom, and Authority, of the *Meſſiah* muſt exclude, and deny, His Eternal and Divine Nature; Which is the ſame *Socinian* Principle, obſerved in Mr. *Lock* above already. And, That, He was fixed to this limited Senſe of the Word, *Lord*, He takes Care to let us know by his Comment upon another Paſſage of the ſame Epiſtle, 1 Cor. 12. 3. *No Man can ſay, that Jeſus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghoſt.* For upon theſe Words, He refers us to underſtand *Lord*, as it is underſtood above. Mr. *Lock* uſually avoids explaining Himſelf, Unneceſſarily, in theſe His Comments, upon Articles of Faith; But contents Himſelf to expreſs Them in the Words of the Sacred Text. For ſo, it is evident, He does, wherever the *Holy Ghoſt, or Spirit*, Occurs to Himſelf, in theſe Epiſtles of *St. Paul*, upon which He gives us His Notes and Paraphraſe. But, here, He had been ſo uſed to ſet aſide the Conſideration of our Lord's Divine Nature, that He would not ſuppoſe, That more was implied in the Word, *Lord*, than only, the Power, and Dominion, of the *Meſſiah*; And that, He had that Title, only, as He was an *Agent* deputed by the Father. That

This is falſe, I need not ſay, it is ſufficient to my Purpoſe, That it is *Socinian.* But it will be very eaſy, alſo, to prove it to be falſe. For the Words, *by whom are all Things*, manifeſtly expreſs to us, that infinite Power, which created all Things; And if *Jeſus* be the *Lord*, which created all Things, then the Word κύριος will imply, not only the Dominion, and Authority, of the *Meſſiah*, but alſo the infinite Relation, and Power, of a Creator, which includes the Divine Nature itſelf. The Words are parallel to thoſe, Joh. 1. 3. Πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, *All Things were made by Him:* And They anſwer the former Part of this Verſe, *To us there is one God, the Father, of whom are all Things*, in the ſame Manner, as the Words of the Evangeliſt do, *The Word was in the Beginning with God, and all Things were made by Him.* For, the Apoſtle is here directing his Diſcourſe againſt the Heathen Worſhip, and their many, and falſe Gods, and Lords; And in oppoſition to Them, He declares the Chriſtian Doctrine to be, That there is but one God, the infinite, and eternal Father, who is the Maker of all Things, and to whom we owe Obedience and Worſhip, and the eternal Son of this Father, the *Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, by whom God made all Things, and through whoſe Interceſſion, our Worſhip, and Obedience is made acceptable to Him. So that the

Word

Word κύριος, in This Place of the New Teſtament, is evidently a Tranſlation of the Word *Jehovah* in the Old, as it is in many other Places of it, (*g*) implying as well an Eternal Exiſtence and Dominion, founded in the Divine Nature, as That, which was imparted, and beſtowed upon Him, in Virtue of His being the *Meſſiah*, and Redeemer of Men. And, therefore, upon all theſe Accounts, The Senſe that Mr. *Lock* gives this Text, appears to be a falſe, and partial Interpretation of it.

But, there is one Place more, in which His Paraphraſe upon the ſacred Text is more evidently, and remarkably *Socinian*, and Unjuſt. It is *Rom.* 9. 5. The Words are, *Whoſe are the Father's and of whom, as concerning the Fleſh, Chriſt came, who is over all, God bleſſed for ever. Amen.* Theſe He paraphraſes, in this Manner. "And of "Them, as to His Fleſhly Extraction, Chriſt "is come, He, who is over All; God be "bleſſed for ever; Amen." And by this Paraphraſe, it is clear, that, He ſuppoſes, That, our Saviour is not Here ſtyled God, ὁ θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, *God bleſſed for ever*; But, That, thoſe Words are only a

(*g*) Rom. 10. 9, 11. Matth. 3. 3. Luke 1. 16. Vid. Pearſon on the Creed. 2 Art. Our Lord.

Doxo-

Doxology, or Form of Benediction, not addreſſed to the Son, but to God the Father; For it is evident, That He does not join them by Appoſition to, ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων, but throws Them into a Diſtinct Sentence, and ſolemn Act of Praiſe to God, without any Relation to *Jeſus Chriſt*, in the ſame Manner, as our modern *Arians* have learned, perhaps from Him, to do. But it is not more certain, that, the Ancient Writers of the Chriſtian Church, as well before, as after, the Council of *Nice*, *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, *Hilary*, *Chryſoſtom*, and many others read This Text, as we do now, and as it ſtands in the *Vulgar*, *Syriack*, *Æthiopick*, *Arabick*, *Coptick*, and *Armenian*, Verſions, than that They underſtood it of, and applied it to, the Divine Nature of *Jeſus Chriſt*. (*h*) Inſomuch, that *Proclus* ſays of it, "That it confutes all the Here-"ſies concerning *Chriſt*," (*i*) and *Theophylact*, That, "*Arius* muſt be aſhamed, and "confounded by it." (*k*) But without relying, entirely, upon Their Senſe, and Interpretation of this Paſſage, I will conſider,

---

(*h*) Irenæus Ed. Oxon. L. 3. c. 18. Tertullianus Adv. Prax. 645. —— 647. Cyprian. Ed. Oxon. ad Quirin. L. 2. *p.* 35. Hilarius Com. in Pſal. 122. Chryſoſt. Homil. 4. in Matth. Tom. 3. Hom. 19. in Rom. Tom. 5.

(*i*) Procl. de Fide *p.* 53.

(*k*) Theoph. in Loc.

how

how the Words themſelves may direct us to underſtand Their Meaning. And

FIRST, I will conſider to whom they may be applied, If we ſuppoſe Them to be an Act of Praiſe, or Benediction, and their Form to be Euchariſtical. As, it is known, to have been the Cuſtom, among the Jews, ſolemnly to bleſs or give Glory, when the Name of God was mention'd, in their Publick Worſhip. (*l*) So St. *Paul*, in this Place and ſome others, in this, and in His other Epiſtles, agreably to that pious Uſage, having mentioned God, may be ſuppoſed immediately to add the Doxology, or Benediction, *Bleſſed for ever. Amen.* So that, wherever, theſe Words are uſed in the Writings of *St. Paul*, upon This Suppoſition, it is Certain, that the Perſon antecedent, Whom They relate to, muſt be God. And ſince, Here, in this Place, the Perſon immediately antecedent is *Jeſus Chriſt*, and is directly referred to by thoſe Words, ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων; it is equally certain alſo, that *Jeſus Chriſt* is God: And in Conſequence, it is an Injury to the Text, to leave the Doxology to be applied, otherwiſe, than to Him, as it is manifeſt Mr. *Lock* has done.

(*l*) Gamara Babylonica. Solomon Jarchi on Deut. 32. 3. Cod. Berachoth. Cap. 9.

BUT,

But, Secondly, The Words may be conſidered, not as an Euchariſtical Form, but as a Profeſſion of Faith; and in this Senſe, alſo, They will unqueſtionably be applicable to the Son alone, as the true, and ſupream God. Since there is no other Perſon, There mention'd, capable of ſuch an Acknowledgment, but He. And that, *St. Paul* might not intend a formal Doxology, Here, in This Place, appears very probable, from the Order of the Words themſelves, ὁ θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. For, wherever a formal Doxology is intended by Him, He places εὐλογητὸς before ὁ θεὸς, as particularly He does, 2 *Cor.* 1. 3. and *Eph.* 1. 3. which are the only Paſſages, in *St. Paul*'s Epiſtles, where it is evident, That, Doxology is intended. As it is, alſo, in Two other Places of the New Teſtament, in the Beginning of *Zacharia*'s Hymn, *Luke* 1. 68. and 1 *Pet.* 1. 3. Which are All the Inſtances of Formal Doxology, in this Expreſſion, in the New Teſtament. And in All of them, the Order of the Words is conſtantly the ſame, εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς. And the Reaſon of this Order ſeems to be an Imitation of the *Hebrew* Idiom, conſtantly obſerved by the LXX Interpreters, in the Old Teſtament, before. (*m*) And therefore, if the Order of the Words

(*m*) For of this Sort are 32 clear Inſtances in the *Septuagint*. and not one to the contrary, except it be *Pſ.* 68. 19. where

Words will not allow Them to be Euchariſtical; They can be only a Confeſſion of the Divine Nature of our *Lord*; and the *Amen*, joyned to Them, in the End of the Verſe, has the ſame Force, which it has in the End of the Apoſtle's Creed. In the ſame manner, as in Two other Paſſages of *St. Paul*'s Epiſtles, *Rom.* 1. 25. 2 *Cor.* 11. 31. where the Expreſſions are, ὅς ἐστιν εὐλογητὸς —— ὁ ὢν εὐλογητὸς —— εἰς τὺς αἰῶνας —— Ἀμὴν. And which, only, declare, that Praiſe, and Bleſſing, and Adoration are due to God; But are not expreſs Acts of ſuch Praiſe and Adoration. For the Characters of actual Doxology are not expreſſed in either of Theſe Three Paſſages; For, there is no direct Addreſs to God, nor is the Verb, uſed in the Doxology, caſt into a Mood Euchariſtical. And therefore, upon the Whole, whether we underſtand the Words of the Paſſage before us, either, as a Doxology, or

---

where in the preſent Greek Text, the Verſe begins thus, Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς εὐλογητὸς. But the *Hebrew* is with the accuſtomed Order of the Words, and the *Septuagint* probably reads corruptly; Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς may belong to the Senſe of the Verſe preceding. St. *Jerom* ſeems to have read it in ſome Copies of his Time, Κύριον, for He tranſlates it *Dominum*, and joins it to the Verſe foregoing. And, it is very probable, that the Genuine, and more ancient, Copies of the *Septuagint* agreed alſo with the *Hebrew*, in this Place, from the *Æthiopick* Verſion, made from the *Septuagint*, and yet agreeing with the *Hebrew* in every Thing material to the preſent Purpoſe.

Profeſ-

Profeſſion of Faith, it is unqueſtionable, that They are an Acknowledgment of the Divine Nature of *Jeſus Chriſt*.

SECT. III.

Proofs, from His Writings, *That He maintained ſeveral other* Socinian *Doctrines.*

THESE Paſſages in His *Paraphraſe*, and *Notes*, are ſufficient, when added to What has been already obſerved, to convince any Unbiaſſed Man, that Mr. *Lock* agrees with the *Socinians*, in His Thoughts of the *Holy Trinity*, tho' Thoſe Two Words are never, but once, mention'd, upon any Occaſion, in any of Thoſe Books, which we have now Cited; how often ſoever they may be found, in any Others, written by Him. But it is not in the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, only, in which Mr. *Lock* was *Socinian*. Moſt of His other Principles, in Religion, in Theſe Tracts, appear to be of the ſame Make with Theirs. To be particular. With the *Socinians* He denies *Original Sin* in Theſe Words. "'Tis ſtrange, that "the New Teſtament ſhould not, any where, "take Notice of the Corruption of Human "Nature, in the Poſterity of *Adam*, and tell "us, That That Corruption ſeized on All, "becauſe of *Adam*'s Tranſgreſſion, as well, "as it tells us ſo, of Death: But, as I re-

"member,

" member, every one's Sin is charged upon " Himſelf only." But This is evidently falſe, It is directly contrary to what St. *Paul* aſſures us, *Rom.* 5. 12, 19. That, *by one Man Sin enter'd into the World, and Death by Sin;* and That, *by One Man's Diſobedience, many were made Sinners.* The Evidence of theſe Paſſages Mr. *Lock* very well underſtood to be againſt Him; and therefore to be conſiſtent with Himſelf, in His Paraphraſe, and Notes, upon theſe Paſſages, He tells us, that He has rendered, the Words *have ſinned,* and *Sinners,* by the Words, *became mortal.* I ſhould be glad to ſee any Proof ſufficient to ſupport ſuch a bold Tranſlation: For, His pretence, that theſe Places are parallel with thoſe, 1 Cor. 15. 22. *As in Adam all dye,* is, manifeſtly, a Begging of the Queſtion. Sin is no Where, in Scripture, in any Inſtance alledged by Him, put for Death. Nor is it, in the leaſt, foreign to the Apoſtle's Deſign, in this Place, where He is proving, that, All Men, from *Adam,* to *Moſes,* dyed in Conſequence of *Adam*'s Tranſgreſſion, to aſſert; That, They were tinctured, alſo, with *Adam*'s Sin. It is clear, That, by *Sinners,* in this Place, muſt be meant ſomething different from *Mortal,* and by *Righteous,* ſomething more, than being *Immortal*; Becauſe, in the 21ſt Verſe of this Chapter, where the ſame Diſcourſe is continued, *Sin* is mentioned as the Meritorious

torious Cauſe of *Death*, and *Righteouſneſs*, as the inſtrumental Cauſe of *Everlaſting Life*. *As Sin hath reigned unto Death, even ſo might Grace reign unto eternal Life.* Whereas, according to Mr. *Lock*'s Interpretation of *Sin* and *Sinners*, St. *Paul* muſt have been abſurd enough, to ſuppoſe, that the ſame Things might, in the ſame Senſe, be both Cauſes and Effects. Mr. *Lock* indeed here refers us to *Dr. Whitby*'s Comments, upon theſe Places, and He might as well have referred us to *Socinus* Himſelf, or any of His Fraternity.

FURTHER, Mr. *Lock*, alſo, with the *Socinians*, denies, That the Puniſhment of Wicked Men, in a Future State, ſhall be eternal. For, as He ſays, "The Death, which "was threatned to *Adam*, and which was "every where the Wages of Sin, as well "after, as before the Reſurrection (*n*) does "not mean eternal Life in Miſery, or to be "kept alive, in perpetual, exquiſite Tor-"ments, (*o*) But a ceaſing to Be, the ha-"ving no more Life, and Senſe than Duſt "has, (*p*) The remaining under Death for "ever, and being utterly loſt, (*q*) and this

(*n*) Reaſ. Chriſt. *p.* 15.
(*o*) ——— *p.* 5.
(*p*) ——— *p.* 6, 7.
(*q*) ——— *p.* 10.

"being

" being the Caſe, that whoever is guilty of " Sin ſhould dye, and ceaſe to be." (*r*) So that it is plain, that Mr. *Lock* ſuppoſes, that no other Death was threatned to *Adam*, or will be inflicted on His Poſterity, either before, or after, the Reſurrection, than only a Temporal Death, and not an Eternal; and That Temporal Death is an Annihilation, or ceaſing to be. For, as Miſeries, and Afflictions, are, ſeveral Times, in the Scriptures, called Death, as particularly, when St. *Paul* ſaid, *I was in Deaths oft*,—and, *I dye daily* (*s*) and, where *Pharaoh* ſays to *Moſes*, and *Aaron*, *Intreat the Lord, that He may take away This Death, only*; (*t*) So it is certain, that, tho' Earthly Powers can only *deſtroy the Body*, yet that, the Heavenly Lawgiver *is able to deſtroy both Body, and Soul, in Hell, with everlaſting Deſtruction*; and has certainly threatned, that He will execute that Sentence, upon finally impenitent, and wicked Men. It is not to be denyed, That, the Meaning of *Death*, when it is conſidered as the *Wages of Sin*, may be known, and aſcertain'd by That *Eternal Life*, to which it is oppoſed. Should it be allowed, that, *Death*, in itſelf, might mean no more, than ceaſing to be, or have Senſe;

(*r*) ——— *p.* 15.
(*s*) 2 Cor. 11. 21.——1 Cor. 15. 31.
(*t*) Exod. 10. 17.

Yet, when it is conſidered, as the *Wages of Sin*, and oppoſed to *Eternal Life*, which is the Reward of Righteouſneſs, the Meaning of it muſt be determined, according to that of its Oppoſite. If *Eternal Life* can be ſuppoſed to mean no more, than Eternal Phyſical Exiſtence; then, *Death*, may reaſonably, be ſuppoſed, to mean no more, than an Eternal Privation of that Phyſical Exiſtence. But if by *Eternal Life*, be meant an Eternity of Exiſtence, in compleat Happineſs; then by *Death*, oppoſed to it, ought, certainly, to be underſtood, an Eternity of Exiſtence in compleat Miſery. What the juſt Idea is of the *Death*, threatned to *Adam*, and declared, after, as well as before, the Reſurrection, to be the *Wages*, that is, the Puniſhment, of *Sin*, can only be gathered from the Scripture. And, *there* Mention is made of a *Death*, as the Conſequence, or *Wages of Sin*, over, and above, the Natural or Phyſical Act of Dying. For that natural *Death* All Men muſt ſubmit to, even tho' Good, and Virtuous, whereas, the Prophet *Ezekiel*, Chap. 18, threatens, that, *the Soul*, or Perſon, *which ſinneth, ſhall dye*; And, on the other Hand, promiſes, that He, who repenteth, and amendeth His Life, *ſhall ſurely live, and not dye*. Now, as the *Death*, here ſpoken of, cannot mean the Separation of Body, and Soul, incident to all Men, both Good, and Bad, alike; So, neither,

ther, can it mean Worldly Judgments, and Untimely, and Violent Deaths. Becauſe, the Prophet declares, that the Juſt Son of a wicked Father ſhall not *dye for the Iniquity of His Father*: And yet, we know, that God hath threatned, *to viſit the Iniquities of the Fathers upon the Children, unto the Third and Fourth Generations of Them, that hate Him*, that is, of the Fathers that hate Him, without making Abatements in Favour of virtuous Deſcendants. And, We know, likewiſe, in Fact, that where there is no Viſible Reaſon for an Intail of Vengeance, that Good Men are viſited with Deaths of this Kind, namely, with temporal Calamities, and ſometimes, with bloody, and untimely Ends. And therefore, it will neceſſarily follow, that by *Life* and *Death*, ſo often mention'd in This 18th Chapter of *Ezekiel*, muſt be meant, the Rewards and Puniſhments of the *Next Life*; with Reſpect to *which*, only, it can be truly ſaid, What is ſaid by the Prophet, *The Soul that ſinneth, it ſhall dye.*

AGAIN, what could Mr. *Lock* think, that *St. Paul* meant, by the *Death* mentioned, and threatened, Rom. 8. 13. *For if ye live after the Fleſh, ye ſhall dye; But if ye, thro' the Spirit, do mortify the Deeds of the Body, ye ſhall live.* Here, *Death* is certainly declared to be the *Wages of Sin*;

And *Life*, the Reward of Virtue, and religious Mortification. Would then Mr. *Lock* ſay, that *St. Paul*, in this Paſſage, only, threatens the Sinners with ceaſing to be, and having no more Life, and Senſe, than Duſt has? Or would He have ſaid, on the other Hand, that He promiſes to the Righteous the Reward of abſolute Immortality? Muſt not They dye, in the Natural Senſe, as well as the Wicked? To ſay the contrary, would be moſt extravagantly abſurd, and falſe. Here, therefore, *Death* means the Puniſhments of a future State, and *Life* the Rewards: And tho' this particular Paſſage does not directly fix the Duration of Either; Yet there are Places of Scripture, which plainly aſſert, both the one, and the other, to be Eternal.

FURTHER, the Puniſhment, to which the Wicked will be ſentenced, at the Judgment of the great Day, is expreſly called, *Death*, ſeveral Times, in the *Revelations*. 'Tis true, the Epithet of *Second* is, ſometimes, joyned to it; but This ſufficiently ſhews, that *Damnation* belongs to the Scripture Notion of *Death*, in the larger Senſe; And therefore, it may juſtly be ſuppoſed Part, and indeed the principal Part, of that *Death*, which was threatned to *Adam*, and which is, every Where, the *Wages of Sin*.

How-

HOWEVER, I will not deny, that Mr. *Lock* ſometimes mentions "Infinite Miſe-"ry, Endleſs Miſery, Unſpeakable Puniſh-"ments, the Indignation, and Wrath, Tri-"bulation, and Anguiſh, which ſhall be, "upon every Soul, that doth Evil, in the "Future Life. And that, He cites the Words of our Saviour, *Matth.* 25. 46. In which, He ſpeaks of *everlaſting Fire*, and *everlaſting Puniſhments*. But whether He had any Secret to reconcile theſe Expreſſions, with His own Idea of *Death*, The ceaſing to be, or Annihilation, I will not determine.

ONCE more, With *Socinus*, alſo, Himſelf, Mr. *Lock* denies, That there is any Notion, or Opinion, of a Deity, naturally, implanted in the Mind of Man. For ſo He ſays, "That God hath ſtamped no Original Cha-"racters on our Minds, wherein we may "read His Being." (*u*) And the principal Reaſon He gives for it, is This, "That be-"ſides Atheiſts, whole Nations have been "diſcovered, among Whom, no Notion of "God was to be found." (*w*) And the very ſame Reaſon is given by *Socinus* Him-

(*u*) Eſſay B. 4. Chap. 10. Sect. 1.
(*w*) ——— B. 1. Chap. 4. Sect. 8.

ſelf; So that He ſeems to have been *originally* inclined to favour the Opinions of that Sect. And even His ſeeming Singularities are derived from Them.

LASTLY, with the *Socinians* Mr. *Lock* denies, the Sacrifice, and Merits, of Chriſt's Death, and the Satisfaction, paid by it, to Divine Juſtice. For, in his Book of *the Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, treating, on Purpoſe, and at large, of the Advantages we have by *Chriſt*, He entirely omits this inconceivable Advantage, ſo often mentioned in Scripture; That, *God had ſet forth Jeſus Chriſt, to be a Propitiation thro' Faith in his Blood—a Propitiation for our Sins, yea, for the Sins of the whole World—We having Redemption thro' His Blood, even the Forgiveneſs of Sins.* (x) In Excuſe for This, Mr. *Lock*, in His *Second Vindication* of Himſelf, and His *Reaſondbleneſs of Chriſtianity*, ſays, (y) "That Satisfaction may "be plainly collected out of His Reaſon-"ableneſs of Chriſtianity;" And it is true indeed, that in that Book He does mention, That the Deſign of Chriſt's coming, "was "to be offered up a Lamb, blameleſs, and "void of Offence, (z) in oppoſition to his

(x) Rom. 3. 25. 1 John 2. 2. Eph. 1. 7. Coloſ. 1. 14.
(y) 2 Vind. *p.* 157.
(z) Reaſ. Chriſt. *p.* 75.

"being

" being put to Death as a ſeditious Male-
" factor, and That He ſpeaks, alſo, of the
" Work of our Redemption," (*a*) and That He mentions His Laying down His Life for Others. (*b*) And His Laying down His Life for both Jews, and Gentiles. (*c*) He ſays alſo elſewhere, ſpeaking of our Saviour's Carriage under His Sufferings, " That He
" freely gave Himſelf to Death for us." (*d*) But all This He does, in ſo looſe, and general a Manner, ſo entirely *en paſſant*, and without any View to the Doctrine of the Satisfaction, That He dares not ſay, that He himſelf takes thoſe Paſſages, to imply Satisfaction, " but only, That They are
" taken to imply it, And that Satisfaction
" may be collected from Them." (*e*) And therefore, in His Notes and Paraphraſe upon *St. Paul*, where He comments upon many Paſſages generally taken to imply the Satisfaction, He gives Them a Senſe and Turn, contrary, and oppoſite, to that Doctrine, which makes it very clear, that it was not, only, out of Caution, and Prudence, as He pretends, That He omitted the Mention of the Merits, and Satisfaction, of the Death

(*a*) ——— *p.* 161.
(*b*) Reaſ. Chriſt. *p.* 208.
(*c*) ——— *p.* 118.
(*d*) 2 Vind. *p.* 400.
(*e*) ——— *p.* 157.

of *Chriſt*, among the Advantages, we received by our Saviour; but becauſe with the *Sociuians*, He did not admit That Doctrine to be true. I will cite and examine ſome of thoſe Paſſages.

In his Notes, on *Rom.* 3. 24, 25. He has theſe Words. "Redemption by *Jeſus Chriſt* "does not import, There was any Compenſation made to God, by paying What "was equal Value, in Conſideration whereof They were delivered. For that is "inconſiſtent with what St. *Paul* expreſly "ſays here, *viz.* That Sinners are juſtified by God *gratis*, or of His free Bounty". This Aſſertion, it is clear, is manifeſtly againſt the Satisfaction, and is therefore *Socinian*. But the Reaſon, on which He grounds it, is too weak to ſupport it. For God's Grace to Sinners is no leſs free, and infinite, in accepting the Compenſation, made for their Sins, to Divine Juſtice, than if He had pardoned, and juſtified Them, without Satisfaction. Since, He was not obliged to accept of any, and ſince, all the Work of our Redemption was the Deſign of His Unſearchable Wiſdom, and Almighty Love. But Mr. *Lock*, in this Place, in order to ſupport His Firſt Aſſertion, ſays further, "That Redeeming "in Scripture Language ſignifies not preciſely paying an Equivalent". And He cites

cites ſome Paſſages, as *Exod.* 6. 6. — *Deut.* 7. 8. which may be allowed to prove that it has not always That Signification, but are no Argument, that, it cannot have it, in other Places, and particularly, Here. But, againſt This He urges, " that if we ad-" here to this Signification of Redemp-" tion, the Equivalent muſt be paid to " thoſe, whom the Redeemed are in Bon-" dage to, and from whom we are re-" deemed, *viz.* Sin, and Satan ". But to This I anſwer, When a Man comes under Bondage to another, in a legal, and equitable, Way, The Price of His Redemption may be ſuppoſed to be due to his Maſter, in Compenſation for Parting with a juſt Right. But Sin and Satan are Uſurpers, who have no Natural Right to Dominion over us; nor could ever acquire ſuch a Dominion, even by our own voluntary Submiſſion. When we became the Servants of Sin, we diſpoſed of what we had no Right to give; we could not make Sin, or Satan, a juſt Title; Their Dominion, therefore, over us not being founded on a juſt Right, They could not juſtly Demand the Price of our Redemption. And there was no Other Party to receive it, but God, our Original, and Only Rightful Maſter, to whom Satisfaction was due, for the Loſs of ſo much actual Service, during our State of Alienation from Him;

and

and who could, in the Nature of the Thing, have no other Satisfaction, than the Puniſhment due to our Sins, or an equivalent Ranſom, which was offered to him, and accepted by Him, namely, the Blood of *Chriſt*. And therefore, When Sinners were thus redeem'd by God Himſelf, it was not againſt ſtrict Juſtice, that He ſhould have both the Redeem'd, and the Price paid for the Redemption too. Since, when the Price of Redemption was paid, the Redeemed, of Courſe, returned to their proper Lord; And therefore, we are aſſured, that We were redeem'd to God, by the Death of *Chriſt*, Rev. 5. 9. *Thou waſt ſlain, and haſt redeemed us to God by thy Blood.*

AGAIN, Verſe 25th of the ſame Chapter, He obſerves, that the Word ἱλαστήριον ſignifies Propitiatory or Mercy-Seat, and not Propitiation. He was aware, that Propitiation, here, might ſignify, an Atonement, made by Sacrifice, which Signification would lead the Reader to ſuppoſe a Satisfaction paid, and therefore He took Care to provide it with another Meaning. But as the Senſe of ἱλαστήριον, in *Heſychius*, is given us by καθαρισμὸν, a Word of Sacrifical Import, and in *Suidas* by θυσιαστήριον; ſo It is obſervable, That the Author of the *Old Vulgat*, probably, underſtood it, Adjectively, by rendring it, *Propitiatorem*, a Perſon qualified to make Atone-

Atonement by his Office, an High Prieſt. And, which is more, and of much greater Authority, We are Twice aſſured, by St. *John*, That, Our Saviour is the ἱλασμὸς, or, *Propitiation for our Sins*. Which Word ſufficiently determins the Signification of ἱλαστήριον, and, without queſtion, implies the Sacrifice of His Death. For the Senſe of St. *Paul* may be ſometimes underſtood by conſulting the Writings of the other Apoſtles, as well, as His own.

I cannot but mention one Paſſage more, for the ſingular Delicacy, and Novelty, in the Interpretation. It is upon *Rom.* 8. 3. The Words of the Apoſtle are; *For what the Law could not do, in that, it was weak thro' the Fleſh, God ſending His own Son in the Likeneſs of ſinful Fleſh, and for Sin, condemned Sin in the Fleſh.* Here, in His Note upon the Weakneſs of the Law, He obſerves, That "Sin was condemn'd, exe-"cuted, and perfectly extinct in the Fleſh "of Chriſt, having there never Had any "Being". This is ſtrange Language, and which He could never learn from St. *Paul*; And methinks, 'tis very difficult to comprehend, how That, which never had Life, or Being, in the Fleſh of Chriſt, ſhould be condemned, executed, and perfectly extinguiſht in Him. Such Expreſſions, in another Man, had been groſs, and palpable Non-

Nonſenſe; I will leave it to You to determine, what They are in Mr. *Lock*. But We ſhall ſee, what He deſigned by Them, in a following Note, upon the Word, *Condemned*, in the ſame Paſſage. For, here, He ſays, "that "the *Proſopopeia*, Whereby Sin was conſi- "dered as a Perſon, in the foregoing Chap- "ter, being continued on Here, the Condem- "ning of Sin, Here, cannot mean as ſome "would have it, that Chriſt was condemned "for Sin, or in the Place of Sin; for That "would be to ſave Sin, and leave that Per- "ſon alive, which Chriſt came to deſtroy. "But the plain Meaning is, that Sin itſelf "was condemned, and put to Death, in His "Fleſh, that is, was ſuffered to have no Life "or Being in it. *He was in all Points,* "*tempted, as we are, yet without Sin*". What abſurd Pains is here taken, to do Violence to a Paſſage, which plainly ſignifies no more, than That *Jeſus Chriſt* was ſent into the World, in a mortal Body, like all other Men, excepting only His Innocence, that He might be made a Sacrifice for our Sins. For this Senſe, the Word ἁμαρτία is known to have, both in the Old Teſtament in the Septuagint Tranſlation, and in the New. (*f*) And, that, in His Suffering for Their

(*f*) Exod. 29. 14. LXX.
Lev. 4. 25.
Heb. 10. 6.
—— 13. 11.

Sins

Sins Men might ſee, and acknowledge, the Juſtice of God's Diſpleaſure againſt Them; And might be perſuaded to forſake Them, as St. *Paul* expreſly ſpeaks, in another Place, (g) which He does not produce, tho' I ſuppoſe, He refers to it. *For He hath made Him to be Sin for us, who knew no Sin, that We might be made the Righteouſneſs of God in Him.* That, This is the proper Senſe, appears, alſo, from the Words of Verſe 4th of this Chapter. *That the Righteouſneſs of the Law might be fulfilled in Us, who walk not, after the Fleſh, but after the Spirit.* The Cauſative Particle, ἵνα, which introduces Them, ſhews their Dependence upon the Words foregoing, and implies clearly, that *Chriſt* ſuffered, or was made an Offering for our Sins; that we might be Righteous thro' an Evangelical Righteouſneſs, by Faith, in Him. And This Senſe, of *Chriſt*'s being condemned for Sin, that is, being made an Offering, or Sacrifice for it, is very far from implying, as Mr. *Lock* ſuppoſes, that He ſuffered in the Place of it, and thereby ſaved Sin; But expreſſes, clearly, His taking it away, and deſtroying it; That, *We might have Redemption from it, thro' His Blood, the Forgiveneſs of Sins,* as

(g) 2 Cor. 5. 21.

the

the Apoſtle ſpeaks, in another Place. (*b*) And I appeal to any Man, whether This be not a much more natural, and intelligible Senſe, than That, which Mr. *Lock* would force upon this Place, That " *Chriſt* " was made an offering for Sin, Sin itſelf " being condemned, and put to Death in " His Fleſh; That is, ſuffered to have no " Life, or Being, in the Fleſh of our Sa- " viour ". Tho', He is ſo fond of This Conſtruction, that He repeats it again, Unneceſſarily, in His Paraphraſe upon Verſe 14th of this Chapter, as He does alſo the ſame Notion of Redemption, which He has given Us above, in *Eph.* 1 14. And It has been already conſidered. But all theſe Harſh and Hard Interpretations appeared plain, and eaſy, to Mr. *Lock*, while they delivered Him from the Doctrine of the Satisfaction of *Chriſt*. For That, it is manifeſt, it was His Deſign entirely to lay aſide.

(*b*) Eph. 1. 7.

SECT.

SECT. IV.

Proofs, that He was a Man of unwarrantable Latitude, in His Principles of Religion.

UPON the Whole, therefore, it appears, that Mr. *Lock* was thoroughly engaged, in the *Socinian* Opinions, and Principles, not only, in thoſe relating to the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, but alſo, in All Thoſe Others, for which the *Socinians* are eſteem'd Heretical, and infamous, among Chriſtians. The Truth is, it is notorious, thro' all Mr. *Lock*'s Works, that He allowed Himſelf a Latitude of Thinking, not only beyond the Bounds, and Reſtraints, of the Definitions, and Determinations, of the Chriſtian Church, but alſo, ſometimes, even beyond Thoſe of Chriſtianity itſelf. This we have already ſeen, and it will, further, appear to any, who gives Himſelf the Trouble to conſider, alſo, His Laws of *Carolina*. For in them, it is plain, what Value He ſuppoſes Civil Governments may put upon Chriſtianity; When it is one of His Fundamental Conſtitutions for that Country, " that any ſe-
" ven, or more Perſons, agreeing in *any*
" Religion ſhall conſtitute a *Church* ".

(*i*) That

(*i*) That Word being intended to comprehend, *Heathens*, *Mahometans*, and *Jews*, as well as *Chriſtians*. For tho' the Civil Government intends, by this Conſtitution, to allow the utmoſt Liberty of Opinion, in Matters of Religion, in Order to the Promoting, and Securing, the Trade, and Peace, of theſe Plantations: Yet, it ſeems very ſtrange, that a Chriſtian Government, ſhould not make ſome little Diſtinction, between a Congregation of Chriſtians, aſſembled for the Worſhip of the true God, thro' *Jeſus Chriſt*, and a Number of *Mahometans*, or *Heathens*, met to worſhip *Mahomet*, or the Devil. Certainly, Civil Peace and Commerce may be maintained, tho' the Chriſtian Religion ſhould have more Favours allowed it, by the Laws, than That of *Jews*, *Mahometans*, or *Heathens*. Civil Governments, themſelves, muſt profeſs, or, at leaſt, pretend to profeſs, ſome Religion. And if that Religion ſhould happen to be the Chriſtian, what Injury could it be to other Religions, or what Scandal to That, even to the Meekneſs and Gentleneſs of it, (as the Lawgiver of *Carolina* ſpeaks) that, Their Laws ſhould give the firſt Degrees of Honour, and Eſteem to it? But, here, by

(*i*) Conſtitution XCVII.

Mr.

Mr. *Lock*'s moſt Chriſtian Conſtitutions, Religion is conſidered, only, as an Inſtrument of Trade; All Religions are put upon the ſame Foot, with Chriſtianity; And the ſacred Name of *Church*, which, *Chriſt* himſelf made peculiar to His own Diſciples, is vilely proſtituted, to be common, to the moſt Impious, and Idolatrous Superſtitions in the World. But this is Mr. *Lock*'s Model of a Religious Comprehenſion. And a glorious one indeed it is, ſince the Devil Himſelf is not excluded out of it. For This Conſtitution is declared to be made, for the Benefit of the Natives of the Place, Heathens, and Idolaters, as well as of Chriſtians, or Others, who were to plant in it.

But tho' All theſe different Religions are allowed, by Mr. *Lock*'s Laws, equal Favours, and Privileges, and are ſuppoſed to be all equally *Churches*; yet, what Terms of Communion can be capable of comprehending All of Them? Mr. *Lock* in another Conſtitution, (*k*) lays down the moſt general He could think of, *viz.*

I. That there is a God.

(*k*) Conſtitution C.

II. That God is publickly to be worſhipped.

III. That 'tis lawful, and the Duty of every Man, when required by His Governours, to ſwear by Him.

But ſure, His Heathen *Churches* can hardly be comprehended, even within Theſe Terms. For there are ſome, Nations, He knows, even among the *Indians*, who own no God at all. Or, if their owning a Multitude of abſurd Divinities (among whom the Devil is one,) may be called, the Belief of a God; Yet, can the Acknowledgement, and Worſhip of Theſe deſerve to be comprehended with That of the true God, whom we Chriſtians worſhip? Or can any Lawgiver, on Earth, make a Fellowſhip between the Worſhip of the true God, and the Worſhip of the Devil? Can a Government, which calls itſelf Chriſtian, dare to form, or maintain, ſuch a Comprehenſion?

But I will not ſuppoſe, that Heathens were to be comprehended within Theſe Terms; nor that They were formed for *Jews*, or *Mahometans*. It ſhall be allowed, that, the Conſtitutions have no Regard to Their Settlement in Theſe Countries.

tries. I will only ſuppoſe, that, Theſe wide Terms of Communion were intended to Comprehend all the different Opinions, or Sects of Men, called *Chriſtians*. And ſince no Mention is made in Them of *Chriſt*, or Chriſtianity; It is to be preſumed, that ſuch Perſons were not to be excluded from This Communion, Who agreed in Theſe General Terms, tho' They had no Agreement, in the Belief of *Chriſt*, or the Fundamentals of Chriſtianity, ſuch as, *Deiſts*, *Quakers*, and *Socinians*; Which, no Doubt, is a very laudable Scheme, and very much for the Honour, and Intereſt of the Chriſtian Religion. But this is all the Favour, that the Religion of Jeſus Chriſt is to expect, when ſuch Men are permitted to be Law-makers, and to form Conſtitutions for it, who are full, only, of the vain Philoſophy, and villanous Craft of this World; and who have nothing ſo much at Heart, as Secular Wealth, and Trade. So that, the Members of the Church of *England* are not to take it amiſs, that, One Article of Theſe Conſtitutions, drawn in its Favour, was diſowned by Mr. *Lock*, as formed againſt His Judgement; (For ſo His Friends tell us;) (*l*) Since He could not afford One Expreſs Law in Favour of Chriſtianity itſelf.

(*l*) *Vid.* Note to Conſtitution XCVI.

I would not willingly ſuſpect, that Mr. *Lock* was as looſe in His Religious Principles, as His great Friends, the Lord *Shaftsbury*, — *Collins* — and *Trenchard*. The Firſt of Whom, Biſhop *Burnet* himſelf tells us, was a *Deiſt* at beſt. (*m*) And, the Two Others have been too well known, to need a Character. But ſure, it muſt be very difficult to reconcile Mr. *Lock*'s Principles, and Schemes, with that Religion, which was taught the World by *Jeſus Chriſt*, and His Apoſtles. And it looks, as if Mr. *Lock* were ſometimes ſenſible of His own Inclination to be an Infidel, when He provides an Opiate for Unbelievers, in Theſe Words in His *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*; (*n*) "It is remarkable, that "in All the Places, where our Saviour "deſcribes His Way of proceeding, in the "Laſt Judgement, the Sentence follows "Doing, or not Doing, without any Men-"tion of Believing, or not Believing. Not "that any, to whom the Goſpel hath been "preached, ſhall be ſaved without Believ-"ing; But that the reſt who want the "Allowance of being juſtified by Faith, "muſt anſwer for all their Actions, and

(*m*) Biſhop *Burnet*'s Hiſtory of his own Times.
(*n*) Reaſon. Chriſt. *p.* 245.

"being

" being found Tranſgreſſors ſhall be con-
" demned ". But it is ſure, that nothing can be more contrary to the Scriptures, than This miſerable Conſolation of Unbelief, is. For our Saviour expreſly tells us, that, *He that believeth, and is baptized, ſhall be ſaved; but He that believeth not, ſhall be damned.* (*o*) And *He, that believeth on Him, is not condemned; but He that believeth not, is condemned already, becauſe He hath not believed on the Name of the only begotten Son of God.* (*p*) And This, is as much, the Determination of the Judge himſelf, as any Deſcription He gives us of His Proceeding, in that Great Day. So that, We are to admit both theſe Things to be true, That Men ſhall be condemned, at the Laſt Day, as well, for being Unbelievers, as for being Workers of Iniquity.

SECT. V.

Proofs, that, He denyed the Doctrine of the TRINITY, *in His Diſpute with the Biſhop of* Worceſter,

AND now, therefore, upon the Whole, I think, I may appeal even to You yourſelf, whether I had not ſufficient

(*o*) Mark 16. 16.
(*p*) John 3. 18.

Grounds to accuſe Mr. *Lock*, of Looſe, and *Socinian* Principles, Both, with Regard to the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, and in the utmoſt Extent of Them. You ſee, I have produced to You, abundant Teſtimonies, for that Purpoſe, out of Writings acknowledged to be His, without enquiring at all, hitherto, into the Controverſy, between the Biſhop of *Worceſter*, and Him. I ſhall now go along with You, a little Way into That, and enquire, whether it appears from Thence, that He had other Principles, than Thoſe, I have charged Him with; particularly in the Doctrine of The *Trinity*.

And Here, You urge in the Behalf of Mr. *Lock*, that He takes Pains to clear, His Terms, His Definitions, and His Whole *Eſſay concerning Human Underſtanding*, from the Charge, or Suſpicion of being of dangerous Conſequence to, or inconſiſtent with, any Article of the Chriſtian Faith; and particularly, Thoſe, contained in the Doctrine of the *Trinity*. And This I will readily grant You without citing any of His Words, becauſe in His *Third Letter*, He is full and large upon this Subject. And I will alſo grant You, that He often complains, in His *Second Letter*, that He was joyn'd with the *Unitarians*.

(q) "The

(*q*) " The World, ſays He, will be apt " to think, that I am the Perſon, who ar- " gue againſt the *Trinity*. (*r*) That I am " one of thoſe, that oppoſe the Doctrine " of the *Trinity*". (*s*) But, as it is not to the Purpoſe, Here, for Me, or You, to determine, which had the Advantage, in the Argument, the Biſhop, or Mr. *Lock*; (Though You boldly preſume to make Yourſelf a Judge in that Matter;) So neither are Mr. *Lock*'s Vindications of Himſelf, or His Complaints, ſufficient to the preſent Purpoſe. For I would ask any impartial Man, Is it ſufficient Proof, that Mr. *Lock* did believe the *Trinity*, that His Terms, or Definitions, or Book, were not of dangerous Conſequence to it? Or becauſe, as He himſelf ſays, They were of no Conſequence at all, either to That, or any Article of the Chriſtian Faith? Or becauſe, the Biſhop could not make it appear, that They were of dangerous Conſequence to it? What rational Connection can be imagined between theſe Two Propoſitions? Mr. *Lock*'s *Eſſay* contains nothing contrary to the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, therefore He believed the Doctrine

(*q*) *Lock*'s Second Letter to the Biſhop of *Worceſter*. p. 7.
(*r*) ——— p. 24.
(*s*) ——— p. 27.

of the *Trinity*. But you ſay, "That He "was concerned to ſatisfy the World, that "He had writ Nothing that could favour "the *Socinian* Principles; and that He "was Unwilling to be ranked among the "*Socinian* Writers". And This indeed I believe, that, Mr. *Lock* was deſirous, that the Biſhop, and the World ſhould think, that His *Eſſay of Human Underſtanding*, and the Philoſophy of it, did not favour *Socinian* Principles. But ſtill I inſiſt, This does not prove that He did not believe Them. It is one Thing, not to have wrote, in a certain, particular Book, againſt the *Trinity*, and another Thing to believe it. It is one Thing to be unwilling to be thought a *Socinian*, and another Thing to diſown their Principles. Mr. *Lock*'s *Eſſay*, as He ſays, might be of no Conſequence at all to any Article of Faith, He might not in That be concerned to ſupport or deny the Doctrine of the *Holy Trinity*; But will it therefore follow, that He was perſuaded of the Truth of it? Or that in other of His Writings, He did not give Occaſion to have His Belief of it queſtioned? Or that He did not, tho' not directly, or in Terms, Yet in Conſequence, deny it? Or that He did not endeavour to deſtroy the Arguments, which ſupport it? For, how far he was really guilty of doing all This, We have already ſeen in

His

His Notes upon St. Paul, *His Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, and His *Two Vindications of it:* And Yet at the ſame Time, and in thoſe very Books, He is angry, to be ſo much as ſuſpected for a *Socinian*, as has been alſo obſerved before. For it is certain, He was a Man of Eclat, and Vanity, He affected to lead, and dictate; and was willing to have his Penetration and Judgement admired, and ſubmitted to. And therefore, of all Things, He endeavoured to avoid an Imputation, which would fix a Character of Infamy upon Himſelf, and His Writings, and forbid Him, at once, all the Hopes, and Glory, of gaining Applauſe, and Diſciples. I wrong Him not in ſaying This, of Him. The Truth of it is viſible, in the Haughty Air He aſſumes, in His Writings, in His *Book of Education*, particularly, in His *Second Vindication of His Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, (*t*) And In many Places of His *Letters*; I might ſay indeed, In all His Works. But here, in the Controverſy between the Biſhop, and Him, when He was told, that the Way to clear Himſelf, from being ſuſpected, not to be a Friend to the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, was to

(*t*) 2 Vind. *p.* 93, 345, 471. Letters, *p.* 291, 284.

declare

declare to the World, that He owned that Doctrine, as it has been received in the Chriſtian Church, He anſwers,

1. THAT He need not clear Himſelf from what was never laid to His Charge. And

2. THAT how the Doctrine of the *Trinity* has been *always* received in the Chriſtian Church, He confeſſed Himſelf ignorant (*u*).

To His firſt Anſwer, I reply, that tho' the Biſhop did not charge Him directly, as oppoſing the Doctrine of the *Trinity*; Yet that He knew, that His Adverſary to His *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity* did warmly Charge Him, as not favouring it. (*w*) And Yet He never thought fit to clear Himſelf from that Imputation.

To His Second Anſwer, I reply, that it was not required of Him to declare, that He owned the Doctrine of the *Trinity* as it has been *always* received in the Chriſtian Church; For He himſelf added the Word, *Always*. He was only adviſed

(*u*) 3 Letter *p.* 7, 9.
(*w*) Socinianiſm unmask'd, *p.* 82.

to

to declare, that He owned it, as it hath been received in the Chriſtian Church. And if He had only declared that He owned it, as it hath been received in the Church of *England*, I doubt not, it would have been thought ſufficient. And therefore, as both theſe Anſwers are falſe, and evaſive; ſo it appears from Them, that He was no Friend to the Doctrine of the *Trinity*.

But He alſo gave the World occaſion to doubt, that He was no Friend to this Doctrine, in another Place of His Third Letter. His Words are theſe, "I do not, *Here*, queſtion the Truth of theſe Propoſitions. "There are Three Perſons in one Nature, "or there are Two Natures in one Perſon; "Nor deny that They may be drawn from "the Scripture. But I deny, that theſe very Propoſitions are in expreſs Words in "my Bible. For that is the only Thing, I "deny, *Here*". Had Mr. *Lock* ſaid, I do not queſtion the Truth of theſe Propoſitions, nor deny, that They may be drawn from Scripture, *abſolutely*, He might poſſibly have given ſome Satisfaction, that He did believe the Doctrine of the *Trinity*. But the Word, *Here* Twice added, I do not *Here* queſtion Their Truth — and the only Thing, I deny, *Here*, leaves it ſtill in Suſpence, or Doubtful, whether He did believe

believe it, or not. *Here*, that is, for This Time, and upon This Occaſion, He does not think fit to expreſs His queſtioning the One, or denying the Other. But He doth not abſolutely ſay, that He does not queſtion, or deny Both. So that, even in This Controverſy between Mr. *Lock* and the Biſhop of *Worceſter*, to which alone you appeal for Evidence to prove, that He was no *Socinian* in the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, it does not appear, by all the Pains, You ſay, He has taken, that He has clear'd Himſelf from That Charge. He is the ſame, ſlippery, evaſive Gentleman Here, that He is every where elſe. And while You imagine, that You have Him ſure, He is gone from You, and is not capable of being fixed.

It is ridiculous therefore for You to ask, "Why ſhould we wantonly throw Him up "for a *Socinian*? Or labour to perſuade the "*Socinians*, that He is on Their Side"? A Man of His Looſe Principles deſerves no better Company. They have a Right in Him. It would be ſcandalous to take Him for a Friend. And it is infinitely honeſter, and ſafer, to diſown, than to keep Him. The *Socinians*, no Doubt, knew the Man, and ſaw Him to be Their own, in whatever Diſguiſe, He appeared to others. Nor can They receive greater Satisfaction, than to ſee Him paſs upon the Church of *England* for

for Orthodox; and the Members of it fooliſhly contending to have Him thought One of Their Communion: While the *Socinians* knew Him to be unalterably Their's, in the great Points of Faith, and Religion. He ſeems indeed, to have been, *originally* of an *Heretical Conſtitution*. He appears every where conceited, ſingular and obſtinate; And He ſeems to have fallen to the *Socinians*, by the Biaſs of His own Genius, and the Force of His own natural Inclinations, and Endowments. And Let Them make the beſt and moſt of Him. We envy Them not the Honour of all His Accompliſhments. No Man of Senſe and Probity will be leſs capable of being convinced of Error, becauſe Mr. *Lock* erred with Him; or will alter His own Opinion, or Judgement, in Complaiſance to the Superiority of His Penetration: And What Fools, or Knaves, may do, is not worth Enquiry.

I exceedingly deſpiſe therefore that Prudence of Yours by which You would have me entertain ſuch an Opinion of Mr. *Lock*, as is utterly inconſiſtent with His Writings. And as it is impoſſible, that Mr. *Lock*'s Doctrines ſhould ever do Service either to the Catholick Church, in general, or to the Church of *England*, in particular: So I will leave it to Yourſelf to conſider, Which of us Two may be ſuppoſed to do the greateſt

teſt Service to either of Theſe? You, who conceal The moſt pernicious Errors, and receive a notorious Heretick, or mortal Enemy to the Faith, and Peace, of Chriſtians, into Communion; or I, who detect and renounce Them Both, and endeavour to excite others to renounce Them? And if You do not know, as You ſay, You do not, that Mr. *Lock* ever received ſuch Treatment, as I give Him, from any other Hand, You force me to ſay, that the Veneration You have for Him is blind, and prejudiced; That You are not entirely acquainted with His Character, or Writings, or what Adverſaries oppoſed Him, more than the Biſhop of *Worceſter*, as Mr. *Edwards*, Mr. *Leigh*, *The Author of* Mr. *Lock's Religion*, and many others, who left the ſame Charge, and Imputation, upon Him, as I have done. And therefore, You ſhould have conſidered a little further, and better, the Writings of the Man, and the Opinion of the Learned, concerning Him, before You Undertook to Defend, and Maintain the Orthodoxy of ſo Exceptionable an Author, as Mr. *Lock*; and with much Goodneſs, and Diſcretion, to reprehend others, for Want of Prudence, and Charity, in ſpeaking That of Him, which all the impartial World knew to be true, and had often ſpoke long before.

WHETHER, the Biſhop of *Worceſter* gave Mr. *Lock* the like Uſage, to what I have done, or no, is not material. It is probable, that the Burden of the good Biſhop's Years inclined Him to be more willing, to wave further Diſpute with Mr. *Lock*, than any Extraordinary Weight, which He felt in His Arguments. He was then, as it were, worn out in Controverſies, in all which, He generally ſilenced His Adverſaries; And therefore, no Doubt, it muſt have given Him ſome Uneaſineſs, to find Himſelf, in the latter End of His Life, engaged with a Man, who, right, or wrong, reſolved never to be anſwered; Who could always find ſomething to ſay; Who dodged perpetually in, and out, of His own Terms, and was in a Manner, Uncomitible. But all This implies no Conviction, that the Biſhop's Apprehenſions of Mr. *Lock* were without Grounds; And much leſs will it forbid Others to think, that even in this Controverſy with the Biſhop, His Principles were not againſt the *Trinity*, For we have already ſeen They were, from ſufficient Evidence.

YOU miſtake therefore much, if You think You puzzle me, when You ask me, the Reaſon of Mr. *Lock*'s Conduct; For I have given a very Conſiſtent Account of it. It is You yourſelf, Who miſtake it, by abſurdly

ſurdly inferring, that, becauſe He took Pains to vindicate His *Eſſay*, upon the Article of the *Trinity*, He gave ſufficient Reaſon for the World to conclude, that He believed it. Anſwer Yourſelf, thoſe Perplexities, which follow from the Miſtake, You run into; I have nothing to do with Them. You would have it, that Mr. *Lock* never diſcovered Himſelf, I have made the Contrary appear Undeniable. You ſay, that "Mr. *Lock* "lived in an Age, when a general Free-"thinking was openly profeſſed with Im-"punity; And therefore, that He did not "juſtify Himſelf, as You call it, out of Fear "of Suffering." You run Yourſelf perpetually into the ſame Miſtakes: He never juſtified Himſelf, in the Opinion of any Impartial Man, to be a Friend to the Doctrine of the *Holy Trinity*. It is true indeed, that He could be under no Fears, which might check His Liberty of thinking; And it is true alſo, That the Security of the Times gave Him Encouragement, to vent His pernicious Opinions, and to ſet Himſelf at the Head of the Freethinking Tribe.

The very Suppoſition therefore of Modeſty, and Humility, and Regard to the Peace of the Church, in ſuch a Man, as He was, looks like a Jeſt, and a Banter upon Him. Let any Man read His Books, and He will ſoon ſee, how little Share He had in

in the Virtues of Modeſty, and Humility. All the Language of Them is quite of another Spirit; And as for His Regard for the Peace of the Church, it is impoſſible, That ſhould have ever entered into His Thoughts. He does not appear to have had any Determinate Notion of the Chriſtian Church; He ſpeaks of Chriſtians, only as of certain Sects of Men, joyned to one another, and Their Leaders, by different Syſtems of Principles, without Mention made of any common Terms of Communion, which might unite Them: As in His *Laws of Carolina*, obſerved above, every Perſuaſion is a *Church*. And, with ſuch a Notion of the *Church*, it is impoſſible, that Peace ſhould be conſiſtent. A *Church*, made up of Sects, is eſſentially a *Chaos*; and muſt ſubſiſt by perpetual Diviſions, and War. Different Doctrines are neceſſary to its Conſtitution, and contrary to the Nature of all the Kingdoms, we ever heard of, This muſt ſtand by being divided.

But if by the Peace of the *Church*, You mean That of The Church of *England*, I ask, How is it poſſible, that He ſhould have any Regard to it, when He notoriouſly oppoſes the Doctrines, and ſpeaks of the Orthodoxy, and the Clergy of it, in Terms of the greateſt Scorn, and Contempt, in the World? I don't love ſuch an Employment,

but give Me Leave, for once, upon this Occaſion, to preſent You with ſome Strokes of this Kind, out of His *Vindications of His Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*. "Fa-"ſhionable Orthodoxy——Prevailing Or-"thodoxy,——Spirit of Orthodoxy, *for* "*Railing*——Faſhionable, Titular, Profeſ-"ſors of Orthodoxy——Pulpit Oratory out "of its Place, *for Railing*——Preaching "Oratory, *for Railing*——Creed Makers, "*very often*——Venerable Mob——The "Brotherhood, who make Religion a Trade;" *For the Fathers of the Church, and Clergy.* This, and a great deal more ſuch Language, which often fell from Him ſhew His Spirit; and That He intended, that His Reflections ſhould not be merely perſonal, and ſting His Antagoniſt only; but ſhould alſo extend to All of His Order, and make Them ſenſible, What a contemptible Opinion, He had of Them All, as well as of the Doctrines which They taught. So that of All Men in the World, Mr. *Lock* muſt be the laſt, who deſerved to be ſuſpected of Modeſty, and Humility, or any good Wiſhes to the Peace of the Church.

And therefore, as for Your Piece of ſecret Hiſtory, concerning Mr. *Lock*'s Acknowledgement to a Friend of Yours, that He did believe the *Trinity;* Your groſs Partiality to Him might be ſufficient Excuſe for Me,

Me, if I told You, I could not believe it. But I will not be ſo hard, I will uſe You better. I will neither admit it to be true, nor deny it. I will let it paſs for Nothing. For admit it to be true, that Mr. *Lock* did ſay, He believed the *Trinity*; How little is to be gained by ſuch a general Acknowledgement! Do we not know, that there are Perſons now living, Eminent in Their Stations, and for Their Learning, who profeſs to believe, and ſubſcribe to the Faith of the *Holy Trinity*, and yet at the ſame Time, as Mr. *Lock* did, diſown the Divine Nature of *Jeſus Chriſt*, and deny the Perſonality, and eternal Exiſtence of the *Holy Ghoſt*?

To ſum up therefore the Whole, concerning Mr. *Lock*'s Religious Principles, and particularly His Belief of the *Trinity*, in my Turn, as You have done. If it appears clearly from Mr. *Lock's Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, and His *Two Vindications of it*, That while He is compiling, what He himſelf calls, a neceſſary Summary, or Syſtem of Chriſtian Faith, He entirely leaves out of it All Conſideration of the Divine Nature of *Jeſus Chriſt*, and perverts, and miſinterprets, All the Texts in the Four Goſpels, and the Acts of the Apoſtles, which relate to, or contain it; If in His *Notes, and Paraphraſe upon the Epiſtles of St. Paul*, He conſtantly purſues the ſame De-

ſign; If in His *Laws of Carolina*, He does not ſo much, as make mention of *Jeſus Chriſt*, in His Terms of Communion, among Chriſtians; And If, even, in His *Letters to the Biſhop of Worceſter*, He artificially declines, and avoids, the Acknowledgement of the Doctrine of the *Trinity*; In ſhort, If by all, that can be collected out of His Writings, it clearly, and publickly appears, that, He was no Friend to This Doctrine, And there is not one ſingle Paſſage to be produced out of Them, in which He expreſſes any Favour for it; If all, You bring in Juſtification of Him, be Miſtake, and Miſinterpretation of His Words, and there is Nothing, which looks like Truth, in what You ſay, in Ballance to all This publick, open, and notorious, Evidence againſt Him, but what dwindles into a little Piece of Secret Hiſtory, which whether true, or falſe, is Nothing to the Purpoſe; Then, I am ſure, I have made good againſt You that Character, which I gave of Mr. *Lock* in my Sermon, that He was a *Socinian Writer*; even, in Your Senſe of that Expreſſion, as You confine it to ſignify, His Denyal of the Doctrine of the *Trinity*.

And If, beſides Theſe, it appears alſo, out of the ſame Writings of Mr. *Lock*, that He embraced, and maintained, many other *Socinian* Principles; If it appears, that He denies

denies *Original Sin*; The *Satisfaction of Jeſus Chriſt for the Sins of Men; The Eternity of the Puniſhments of the Wicked, in a Future State; That the Notion of a Deity is naturally implanted in the Minds of Men;* And, what will now be the more immediate Subject of Controverſy, between Us Two, *The Reſurrection of the ſame Body*; And which, I omitted to conſider, particularly before, becauſe it will preſently, at large, be diſcuſſed; I ſay, if Mr. *Lock* has adopted, alſo, all Theſe *Socinian* Principles, for His own; Then, it is clear, that He is entirely a *Socinian*, and You muſt either abandon Him, and drop Your Defence of His Orthodoxy; or be content to be thought a very weak, abſurd, and partial Advocate for Him.

It is, therefore, now my Turn to deſire You to conſider, Which of Us Two has done the greateſt Juſtice to Mr. *Lock*? And Whether my rough Draught of Him does not repreſent the Original, with more Life, and Truth, than All the falſe Colouring, You have beſtowed upon Him? So that I believe, that I have nothing to repent of for what I have ſaid, of Your celebrated Friend; and I wiſh You had as little. To be acted, blindly, by the Fame, and Reputation, which other Men gain in the World, is a Weakneſs, which cannot be anſwered,

to Senſe, or Probity, or Virtue, and a Good Chriſtian ought to have nothing dearer to Him, than His Faith. You know, that We are told, that, *Tho' it were an Angel from Heaven*, who ſhou'd contradict it, *He ought to be accurſed.*

The Part, which I undertook, was the Defence of the Doctrine of the Church of *Chriſt*, in all Ages, and That, I am ſure, ought to be looked upon as a pious, and honourable Deſign, and Undertaking, even, tho' it had not been performed with that Succeſs, that Beauty of Stile, that Force of Reaſoning, which ſo noble a Cauſe deſerves. —In Oppoſition to This, You ſet up the private Opinion, and Character, of a ſingle Gentleman, eminent indeed for Logical Triflings, and Metaphyſical Subtleties, among Men of ſpeculative Learning, but very far from being celebrated for His Experience or Skill in divine Studies, or for His Soundneſs of Judgement, in Matters of Faith, and Religion.

Consider, therefore, with Yourſelf, What Modeſty, What Diſcretion, and Piety, there can poſſibly be, in extravagantly preferring the Sentiments, and Reputation, of ſuch a Man, before Thoſe of the Catholick Church of *Chriſt*. Conſider the Scandal, and Diſhonour, You hereby bring upon the Chri-

Chriſtian Name; How much You encourage the Impudence, and Scorn, of the Enemies of our Faith; and How much You expoſe Yourſelf, to the Contempt of Good, and Thinking Chriſtians; eſpecially when it appears, that This celebrated Man of Your's, lived, and dyed, a profeſſed, and obſtinate Heretick, and, of one of the worſt, and moſt infamous Kinds, a *Socinian*.

An Anſwer to ſome Additions, from the ſame Hand.

AND now, Sir, tho' I will not venture to ſay any Thing, againſt the Fullneſs of your Perſuaſion, in particular, that Mr. *Lock* was no *Socinian*: Yet, ſure it muſt be hard to conceive, How a Man can be fully perſuaded of a Negative. Some Occaſions, and Grounds for ſuch a Suſpicion, You have conſidered, and think, that You have found Them inſufficient for that Proof; But, a full Perſuaſion ought, You know, to proceed from a diſtinct Examination of every poſſible Ground, or Occaſion for it: Which is an Enterprize, that You have not yet been bold enough to undertake, and, I hope, never will. You produce Two Sorts of Evidence in Mr. *Lock*'s Vindication; One, from the Defence He makes of His *Eſſay*, on the Article of the *Trinity*; The Other, from ſecret Hiſtory. And, upon Examination,

Both of Them appear Weak, and inconclusive. But, let Us ſuppoſe, that, Theſe Two Evidences could have been ſufficiently ſupported by You; can You ſuffer Yourſelf to be fully perſuaded of the Innocence of the Man, till You have conſidered, what other Matter may be, and hath been brought, to prove Him guilty? While You view Mr. *Lock* in This Aſpect, only, the View of Him is partial; You ſee Him not in all Lights; nor in His proper Altitude; And You muſt often change Your Situation, to make a full Diſcovery of Him. Something of This, You were ſenſible of, it ſeems, upon the Additions, which You thought fit to make to Your Letter; And therefore, for further Proof, that He was not a *Socinian*, You refer me to ſome Paſſages, in His *Comments on St.* Paul's *Epiſtles*, "which, You ſay, plainly aſſert, or imply, the direct contrary, "to ſeveral of the moſt conſiderable Errors "of the *Socinians*." One of theſe Errors is, the Denyal of the Neceſſity, and Efficacy, of Divine Grace, and the Spirit of God, as a new quickning Principle, in the Heart of Man. And againſt This, You refer me to Mr. *Lock*'s Notes on *Rom.* VIII. 11. 2 *Cor.* VIII. 1. In the firſt of which Notes, I grant, that Mr. *Lock* owns, What You cite Him for; And therefore in this Point He is not *Socinian*; nor is He by Me charged, in this Point, as ſuch. But is the

Conſe-

Conſequence Neceſſary, Mr. *Lock* was a *Socinian* Writer, therefore He was in every Point *Socinian?* Set aſide This, in What other Point conſiderable, does He diſſent from Them? What further Proof can be neceſſary to ſhew Him *Socinian*, after ſo many Evidences of his Agreement with Them? But You now tell Me further, that there is alſo a Paſſage, in Mr. *Lock*'s *Notes* on one Place of St. *Paul*'s Epiſtles, which, You think, implies, likewiſe, that is, beſides the Neceſſity of divine Grace, contains, an Acknowledgement of our Saviour's Divinity. And the Paſſage, which You cite for your Purpoſe, is This, "The New Teſtament "teaches, that Thoſe, who receive *Chriſt* "by Faith, with Him receive His *Spirit*, "and its Aſſiſtance againſt the Fleſh. — "And ſo, *Spirit*, Here, may be taken "for the *Spirit* of their Minds, but re- "newed, and ſtrengthened by the *Spirit* "of God". And from theſe Words, You make this Inference, "This is plainly aſ- "ſerting the *Spirit* of God, and the *Spi- "rit* of *Chriſt*, to be the ſame". But to This I anſwer, That, tho' Mr. *Lock* ſhould be allowed, to intimate, in theſe Words, that the *Spirit of Chriſt* and the *Spirit* of God, was the ſame; Yet it will by no Means follow, that therefore, They imply an Acknowledgement of *Chriſt*'s Divi-

Divinity; becauſe, tho' no Divinity ſhould belong to *Chriſt*, Yet the *Spirit of Chriſt*, and of God, may, notwithſtanding, be the ſame: It is no neceſſary Conſequence, that Mr. *Lock* acknowledgeth *Chriſt* to be God, becauſe He ſays that Chriſtians, who receive the *Spirit of Chriſt*, are renew'd, and ſtrengthened, in Their Minds, by the *Spirit* of God. For *Firſt*, Mr. *Lock* ſays, expreſly, in the Note, out of which You produce theſe Words, that *Spirit* ſignifies the Goſpel, and ſo *Spirit* of *Chriſt* may imply no more, than the Goſpel of *Chriſt*; and receiving His *Spirit*, no more, than receiving His Goſpel. But how, a bare Acknowledgement, that They, who receive the Goſpel, or in this Senſe, the *Spirit* of *Chriſt*, are ſtrengthened by the *Spirit* of God, implies the Divinity of *Chriſt*, will be a Task very difficult for You to prove. But, *Secondly*, Let it be ſaid, if You pleaſe, that by *Spirit* of *Chriſt*, in this Place, is meant, a Divine Power, and Aſſiſtance, given to Chriſtians by *Jeſus Chriſt*; Will it follow from that one Paſſage of Mr. *Lock*'s, that He acknowledged *Chriſt* to be God, becauſe He is allowed to ſay, that the Divine Power is communicated to Chriſtians by Him? Will not the Followers of *Arius* allow, that Divine Aſſiſtance is communicated to Chriſtians, by *Jeſus Chriſt*? How wide aſun-

der

der are theſe Two Propoſitions, *Chriſt* derives to Chriſtians the *Spirit* of God, by which They are ſtrengthened; therefore *Chriſt* is God? It no where appears, that Mr. *Lock* means any Thing elſe by *Spirit* of God, than only a Divine Power or Energy. And can it be any Argument that Mr. *Lock* acknowledgeth the Divinity of *Jeſus Chriſt*, becauſe He acknowledges, that He had a Divine Power, or Energy, or that He had alſo Authority to communicate that Divine Power, or Energy? Might not ſuch a Power be given Him, as He was the *Meſſiah*, the Mediator between God, and Man, tho' His Nature was not Divine? Mr. *Lock* in the Note, to which You refer me, opens His Senſe of the *Spirit* of *Chriſt*, by referring to *Rom.* 8. 9, — 11. But when You turn Thither, the Words of His Paraphraſe (for Note He hath there none) are theſe. "And ſo having received "the Goſpel, You have therewith received "the *Spirit* of God: For as many as re- "ceive *Chriſt*, He gives Power to become "the Sons of God: And to Thoſe that are "His Sons, God gives His *Spirit*". Where is the leaſt Appearance of the Acknowledgement of the Divinity of *Jeſus Chriſt*, in theſe Words? And indeed, upon the Whole, How ridiculous is it to endeavour to ſqueeze an Acknowledgement of the Divi-

Divinity of *Jeſus Chriſt*, by Conſequence, and Implication only, from the Words of a Man, Who, no where, in any of His Writings, in any direct Words, makes any ſuch Acknowledgement; but every where moſt ſtudiouſly avoids it; and bends His whole Force to make the Acknowledgement, not only Unneceſſary, but alſo Falſe? as I have ſhewed already.

In the next Place, You proceed to conſider another Doctrine contradicted, and denyed, by *Socinians*; the Doctrine of *Our Saviour's Satisfaction for Sin*. And this Doctrine, You dare not ſay, Mr. *Lock* any where openly, and expreſly, teaches, or aſſerts, againſt Them. His Note, upon the Word, *Redemption*, Rom. 3. 24. is, all of it, throughout, direct Oppoſition, and flat Contradiction to it; and You ſeem to grant as much. All, that You take the Advantage of, is, that an Author, who hath writ Remarks on Mr. *Lock*'s *Notes and Paraphraſe*, does yet, in His Cenſure of that Note, in particular, ſay, that "Mr. *Lock* in other Places "aſſerts the ſame Thing, which He de- "nies to be the Senſe of the Word, *Redemption*, There". And ſo far, I grant, what This Author ſays, to be true, that Mr. *Lock*, in the Two cited Places, 1 *Cor.* 6. 20. — 7. 23. retains, in His Paraphraſe, the

the Words of the Apoſtle, (if that may deſerve to be called a Paraphraſe, where the Words of the Author are explained by Themſelves) and that He paraphraſes the Words, *bought with a Price*, in both Places, by the Words, *bought with a Price*, adding, only, in the Firſt, viz. *the precious Blood of Chriſt*, without any Note to explain that Phraſe, further. I alſo grant, that in His Note on *Rom.* 4. 25. He ſays, that our Saviour by His Death atoned for our Sins, and ſo, we were innocent. And that He gives Us the Words of the Apoſtle, again, for a Paraphraſe of Themſelves, *Eph.* 5. 2. *Chriſt has given Himſelf for Us an Offering, and a Sacrifice to God*, only explaining, The Words, *of a ſweet ſmelling Savour*, by the Word, *Acceptable*. And I will allow to You, further, that, in All the Texts of St. *Paul*, which in the Note, by You juſt now cited, "He "ſets down together, as the Apoſtle's own "Explication of His Doctrine" concerning *the Satisfaction*, as far as His Notes, and Paraphraſe go, in Them, that is to ſay, in *Rom.* 3. 25. & 5. 6, 10. *Eph.* 1. 7. & 5. 2. He does Nothing elſe, but repeat the Apoſtle's own Words to explain Them. But I muſt tell You, that neither You, nor any of Mr. *Lock*'s Friends, will be, in the leaſt, any Gainers, by all theſe Conceſſions. For it is always Mr. *Lock*'s

Lock's Method, When He has no Mind to explain Himſelf upon any Doctrine of Chriſtian Faith, or Religion, to leave it, as He found it, only, in the General Words of Scripture. And then, He knew, that He left it in His own Power, at any Time, to give it what particular Turn, or Explication He pleaſed. And the Truth of This, I have in theſe Papers, ſeveral Times, made appear. And, I muſt ſay, further, Here, that after what Mr. *Lock* has ſaid, in His Note, upon the Words, *Redemption*, and *Propitiation*, Rom. 3. 24, 25. it muſt be next to impoſſible to conceive, How He could give thoſe general Words of Scripture, *Atone, Given for us, Offering, Sacrifice*, any Senſe, which could be applied in Favour of the Doctrine of the *Satisfaction of Jeſus Chriſt, for the Sins of Men.*

So that, the Additions, You, Here, make to the Defence of Your Friend, add, only, to the Length of it; but give it not the leaſt Improvement, in Strength; nor weaken the leaſt Argument uſed againſt Him. He is ſtill, where He was; He did neither believe the *Trinity*, nor the Divinity of our Saviour. Sufficient Proof hath been made to the contrary. And in all the other important Points, where He is charged to have favoured, and maintained,

tained, *Socinian* Doctrines, He ſtill appears to be charged with Truth, and Juſtice, which is as much in this Caſe, as I am obliged to conſider.

And Here therefore, I diſmiſs Him, and all Conſiderations of His Orthodoxy, with Relation to the Doctrine of the *Trinity*; and paſs with You now to conſider Him in another, and with Regard to the Reſurrection of the *Same Body*, the Great, and Important Subject of the Sermon.



A

DEFENCE

OF THE

DOCTRINE of the *Reſurrection of the ſame Body.*

PART II.

CHAP. I.

Of the Reſurrection of the Same Body, *in General.*



OU begin Your Enquiries, under This Head, with telling Me, " that, You are ſurpri-
" zed to find, warm and ar-
" gry Expreſſions uſed againſt
" Mr. *Lock*: Since, as You conceive, in
" His Diſcuſſion of that Point, He had

" given little, or no, Cauſe of Offence ". And I will freely confeſs to You, that an honeſt Concern for Truth, and for What, I take to be a Great, and Fundamental, Article of the Chriſtian Faith, is apt, as the Sermon owns, to raiſe a juſt Indignation in Me, when I ſee Them Denyed, or Contradicted. And if I expreſs my Reſentments in Words of ſome Warmth, or even Anger, I think the Occaſion will bear me out: Paſſions may be very properly employed in ſuch Provocations; They ſeem to be given Us on Purpoſe; and on theſe Occaſions We certainly may be angry, and ſin not. It is true, the Sermon calls the Subject, it treats of, contentious; But not, becauſe it does juſtly, and in itſelf, deſerve to be called ſo, as You ſurmize, but, becauſe many Enemies of our Faith, among Whom, I muſt reckon Mr. *Lock* to be One, have made it ſuch, by contending againſt it. I will allow You to be as great a Thinker as You pleaſe, and You ſhall be allowed to imagine what You pleaſe, in Favour of Your glorious Friend, and to the Diſadvantage of thoſe, Who are ſo Audacious, as to ſpeak, or write, againſt Him: But ſure Your Thoughts are very poorly employed, if They can allow You to ſay, that a Diſcourſe, upon an Article of Faith, could want Weight and Importance, if Mr. *Lock*'s eminent Name had not been men-

mention'd in it. Can the Eminence of any Name add Worth to Truth? Can any Point of Chriſtian Faith receive Weight and Importance, from the Arguings of weak and fallible Men? Is it poſſible, They ſhould be ennobled by their Oppoſitions and Hereſies? Think again. But you are as much miſtaken alſo, concerning Your Friend's Eminence; tho' Your Pages run over with nauſeous Flouriſh upon Him. I aſſure You, the Gentlemen of that Learned Audience, to which the Diſcourſe was addreſſed, are content with far meaner Thoughts of Him, than You have entertained: And think that little Honour is to be gained by the Mention, or even by the Confutation of Him. His Hereſies are Yet infamous among Them; and are often honeſtly expoſed, and ſolidly diſproved, by Them. The Learned of the Univerſity allow Mr. *Lock* the Credit, He deſerves from His *Eſſay*, (tho' it went once very near His Heart to think They would not.) (*a*) Thoſe Logical Books of His, are allowed Their proper Uſe among Them; And to be of more Value, perhaps, than *Crackanthorp*, or *Stakly*, or *Smiglecius*. But They never ſuppoſed, That He was an Eminent, or Orthodox, or Learned Writer in Divinity, or a juſt Interpreter of the

(a) *Vide* Lett. above.

Scriptures. I will allow You, Gentlemen of Moderation, not to feel ſuch Reſentments, or Emotions of Paſſion, as I here confeſs. But I don't think that it is for Your Reputation, or That You are more capable, hereby, of diſcovering, or maintaining Truth, or of expreſſing Your due Concern for it, than I, or any other Perſon, whom You may think fit to ſneer, for the juſt, and honeſt Exerciſe of Our natural Paſſions. I am ſure, the Apoſtle requires Chriſtians, *to contend*, even *Earneſtly, for the Faith, once delivered to the Saints.* (*b*) And I believe, You will hardly conceive, how They can do this, without ſome Emotion, even of their Paſſions. And Mr. *Lock*'s own Apoſtle, St. *Paul*, expreſly commands *Titus*, to *rebuke Them ſharply, who are not ſound in the Faith.* (*c*) Men, that can ſtand by cold, and indifferent, and ſee the Truth, and Honour, of Their Religion invaded, are ſcarce like to dye Martyrs for it: Their Indifferency to its Enemies ſettles, by Degrees, into an Indifferency to itſelf; And from Want of Courage to Defend it, They are led firſt to betray, and then to deſert, and deny it. Something, like This, ſeems to have happen'd to Yourſelf; Who,

(*b*) Jude V. 3.
(*c*) Tit. 1. 13.

out

out of a fond and idle Partiality to Mr. *Lock*, come to think favourably of His Doctrine; and ſet up to be an Advocate for one of His *Socinian* Principles, in denying the Reſurrection of the *Same Body* to be an Article of Faith.

SECT. I.

The Queſtion ſtated.

IT is nothing to my Purpoſe to enquire, How Your celebrated Friend came to Diſpute this Point with the Biſhop of *Worceſter*; or How the Biſhop came to charge Him with Denying it. I am not bound to argue againſt Mr. *Lock* or You, upon the Biſhop's Grounds; Nor does Mr. *Lock*'s Doctrine of the Reſurrection depend upon the Biſhop's Fancy, (as You Learnedly ſpeak,) That His Idea of Perſonal *Identity* was inconſiſtent with the Reſurrection of the *Same Body*. It was ſufficient to the Deſign of the Sermon, and it is ſufficient to My preſent Deſign, to obſerve, that Mr. *Lock* in That Diſpute did ſeveral Times deny the Reſurrection of the *Same Body*. And it was upon that Ground, that I looked upon Him, Then, and upon Him, and You, Now, to Deny, and Oppoſe, the Chriſtian Faith.

NEITHER, is it more to the Purpoſe, " that You tell me, that Mr. *Lock* fre- " quently, and earneſtly, expreſſes His Be- " lief of the Laſt Judgement, the Reſur- " rection of the Dead, and that the Dead " ſhall riſe again with *Their* Bodies ". For are there None, who believe the Laſt Judgement, and yet deny a Reſurrection? And is it not clear both of Mr. *Lock*, and You, that While You own the Reſurrec- tion of the Dead, and that the Dead ſhall riſe again with *Their* Bodies, You under- ſtand thoſe Words, in a Senſe different from That, in which They have been Uſually Underſtood, in the Catholick Church of *Chriſt?* And You Underſtand by Them, neither the Reſurrection of the *Same Body*, nor even of the *Body* at all. This I will make appear, *Firſt*, of Mr. *Lock*, and then of Courſe, it will appear alſo of Yourſelf. For all the Honour You are like to get by defending Him, is only to be thought His Eccho, and Appendix, and to follow Him, like His Shadow.

Mr. *Lock* in His Third Letter, (*d*) has theſe Words, " In the New Teſtament, I " find our Saviour, and the Apoſtles to " preach the Reſurrection Of The Dead,

(*d*) 3 Lett. *p.* 166.

" and

" and The Reſurrrection from the Dead, " in many Places; But I do not remem- " ber any Place, where the Reſurrection " of the *Same Body* is ſo much as men- " tioned; Nay, which is very Remarkable " in the Caſe, I do not remember, in any " Place of the New Teſtament, where the " General Reſurrection at the laſt Day is " ſpoken of, Any ſuch Expreſſion, as the " Reſurrection of the *Body*, and Much " leſs of the *Same Body*". He goes on from this Place to *Page* 199, in a Courſe of anſwering the Biſhop's Arguments for the Reſurrection of the *Same Body*; and ſuch of Them, as are pertinent to our Purpoſe, ſhall be anſwer'd in Their proper Place. But Here at this Page, He gives Us ſome poſitive Arguments of His own, why by the Dead we are not to underſtand the *Bodies* of the Dead; and returning again to the Biſhop, *Page* 202, He concludes on this Manner. " When " I writ my *Eſſay*, I took it for granted, " as, I doubt not, but many others have " done, that the Scriptures have men- " tioned, in expreſs Terms, the Reſurrec- " tion of the *Body*; But looking more " narrowly, into What Revelation has de- " clared concerning the Reſurrection, I " find no ſuch expreſs Words in the Scrip- " ture, as that the *Body* ſhall riſe; or be " raiſed; Or the Reſurrection of the *Body*.

" I ſhall therefore, in the next Edition of " it, change theſe Words of my *Eſſay*, " B. 4. Ch. 18. Sect. 7. The Dead *Bodies* " of Men ſhall riſe, into thoſe of the " Scripture, The Dead ſhall riſe; Not " that I queſtion, that the Dead ſhall be " raiſed with *Bodies*". Page 210.

Now, from theſe Paſſages, it is clear, What was Mr. *Lock*'s Opinion of the Reſurrection; and in Oppoſition to it, It was the Deſign of the Sermon to ſhew, That Not only the *Bodies* of Men ſhall be raiſed at the Reſurrection, but the *Same Bodies* alſo, in which the Dead lived before; That the *Sameneſs* of Human *Bodies* implies, Not a Philoſophical, and Mathematical *Identity*, but ſuch a Vulgar *Sameneſs*, as every Man allows His own *Body* to have, from His Childhood, to His laſt Declenſions; and that This *Sameneſs* of the Human *Body*, at the Reſurrection, is grounded upon the expreſs Words, and clear Intimations of Scripture. This is the ſhort State of the Caſe between Mr. *Lock*, and Myſelf. You appear in Defence of Mr. *Lock*'s Opinion; and I muſt Defend That, which I will have Leave to call, Not my Own, but That of the Catholick Church of *Chriſt*. I have obſerved to You already, that the Compariſon between, and the Preſumption for, the Truth of, the

Two

Two Opinions, is vaſtly different. The Conteſt is very Unequal. You have not a ſingle Man for Your Adverſary, but the Catholick Church; and You ought to bluſh, when You reflect, whom You undertake to diſpute with; And I appeal to the unprejudiced and impartial, therefore, not only, Which Side is moſt likely to be in Poſſeſſion of the Truth; But Which Side does poſſeſs it; when the Arguments on both Sides ſhall be conſidered?

SECT. II.

The Firſt General Defence of Mr. Lock *Conſidered.*

THE firſt Thing, You urge in Defence of Mr. *Lock*, is This. "That "He expreſſes His Belief of the Laſt "Judgement; The Reſurrection of the "Dead; and That the Dead ſhall riſe "again with *Their* Bodies; And This "ſhould ſecure Him from being taxed with "Infidelity or Hereſy, with Reſpect to the "Article of the Reſurrection. Becauſe "This, You ſay, is ſurely All, that is im-"portant to the great Ends of Religion, "in that Article; Whatever He may think "of the Reſurrection of the *Same Body*". And This is the ſame, that Mr. *Lock* ſays for Himſelf, in the Words, which You have

have cited out of Him. 3 *Lett.* pag. 178. Therefore I ſhall not repeat Them to You. But give Me Leave to ask You, Do You think it ſufficient, to prove Your own, or any Man's Belief to be true, that You can ſay of it, that it contains all that is important to the great Ends of Religion? Or can any Faith anſwer the great Ends of Religion, which is not agreable to That, which God delivers to Us, in the Scriptures? The great Ends of Religion cannot be anſwered, without a Particular Belief of what God has revealed there, as neceſſary to Salvation. And, That the Belief of the Reſurrection is neceſſary to Salvation, appears from Thoſe Words of St. *Paul.* (e) *If there be no Reſurrection of the Dead, then is Chriſt not riſen; And if Chriſt be not riſen, then is our Preaching vain, and Your Faith is alſo vain.* — *Ye are Yet in Your Sins.* But now, if the Reſurrection of the Dead always implies, in Scripture, the Reſurrection of the *Body*, and of the *Same Body*; And if Mr. *Lock*'s, and Your Faith of the Reſurrection imply no ſuch Thing; It is certain, that Your Belief of this Article is not agreable to What God has revealed concerning it; And conſequently, Both He,

(e) 1 Cor. 15, 13, 14, 17.

and

and You, may be juſtly tax'd with Infidelity, or Hereſy, with Regard to the Doctrine of the Reſurrection, notwithſtanding Your Belief of the Laſt Judgement, and the Reſurrection of The Dead, and that the Dead ſhall riſe again with *Their* Bodies. To be, all that is important to the great Ends of Religion, is an Expreſſion of great Latitude, Obſcure, Uncertain, and Equivocal, and there is no Hereſy, which may not be ſheltered under, or skreened by it. The Heretical Chriſtians, who deny any Reſurrection, no doubt, ſuppoſe, That, all that is important to the great Ends of Religion, is ſufficiently contain'd, in the Belief of the Laſt Judgement, and a future State of Rewards, and Puniſhments. The *Arians* urge the ſame Plea for Themſelves, when They deny the Divine Nature of *Jeſus Chriſt*; And the *Socinians* are not without the ſame Pretence; When they ſuppoſe Him to be a mere Man. It is Eſſential to all Hereſy, to ſubſtitute falſe Opinions, into the Room of Articles of Faith, and then to ſuppoſe Them to be true, upon That Foundation, becauſe They anſwer the great Ends of Religion. And we may well imagine, that this is one great Art, whereby the Enemy of Truth ſeduces, vain, and opinionative, Men, from it. Certainly it is of the laſt Importance to Religion, to preſerve

our

our Faith, not only within the Words of Scripture, and Expreſſions of Revelation, but agreable alſo, to that Senſe of thoſe Words, and Expreſſions, which hath been received, in the Church of *Chriſt*; and which, upon Mr. *Lock*'s own Method of Interpretation, by comparing one Paſſage of the ſacred Books, with another, appears to be true, and genuine. It ſuited well with Mr. *Lock*'s artful, and equivocal Way of Writing, to cover His Opinion with the General Words of Scripture. And it is generally known to be the Practice of all Hereticks to do ſo. General Words are capable of being applied to many Senſes. And ſome of Thoſe Senſes may be falſe, or mixed with Falſhood. They muſt be limited to a particular Meaning, to have their proper Senſe aſcertain'd, and underſtood. And This particular Meaning, in the Caſe before Us, the Scriptures themſelves, as well as the conſtant Senſe of the Chriſtian Church, have ſtated to us; As appears from the Sermon, and will farther, from What ſhall be ſaid to it, by and by. But it was not agreable to Mr. *Lock*'s Faith, or Practice, to concern Himſelf with This. And therefore, whatever You, or He may preſume, He muſt not be acquitted from being guilty of any Thing, inconſiſtent with the Article of the Reſurrection, tho' He believes, that, All the Dead

Dead ſhall be raiſed. Since, it is clear, that under the general Protection of that Doctrine, He conceals the Denyal of the Reſurrection of the *Body*, the *Same Body*; which is the particular Senſe, to which the Scriptures themſelves, as well as the Church of *Chriſt*, have ever limited, That general Expreſſion, of the Reſurrection of the Dead.

SECT. III.

The Second General Defence of Mr. Lock *conſidered.*

YOU proceed, in the next Place, to tell Me, that, "what Particles of Mat-"ter, the Reſurrection Body ſhall be made "up of, Mr. *Lock* thinks this a Queſtion of "Curioſity, which, the Scriptures having "ſaid nothing of, He modeſtly concludes is "not for Him to determine." But I take the Liberty to anſwer, that Mr. *Lock*'s Thoughts are generally His own; of a peculiar Form, and Kind; And That there is no more Streſs to be laid upon Them, than is due to the Reaſons, He brings to ſupport Them. For When He ſays, that the Scriptures have ſaid nothing of What Particles of Matter the Reſurrection *Body* ſhall be made up, He ſpeaks ſophiſtically, and uſes an Expreſſion capable of ſeveral Meanings; but very proper to puzzle and perplex His Reader:

Reader: Some of Them being manifeſtly true, and others as manifeſtly falſe. For, if by thoſe Words, " the Scriptures have ſaid " Nothing of what Particles of Matter the " Reſurrection *Body* ſhall be made up," Mr. *Lock* means, that thoſe very Words are not in the Scriptures, as poſſibly He may, There can be no Queſtion, but it is moſt true: Or if by thoſe Words He means, that the Scripture ſtates not, preciſely, and Philoſophically, of what Contexture the Riſing *Body* ſhall be; This alſo ſhall be allowed to be true: But if He intends by thoſe Expreſſions, that the Scripture ſays Nothing, directly, or indirectly, of the Reſurrection of the *Body*, and of the *Same Body*; This, I ſay, is manifeſtly falſe; as will appear by the Proof, We ſhall make by and by. So that His Queſtion of Curioſity, is far enough from being Our Queſtion; and it would not be Want of Modeſty in Him, but Impertinence to determine it; And give Me Leave to caution You once more, Not to be ſo fond of mentioning Mr. *Lock*'s Modeſty. For I could never learn, from any Part of His Writings, that His Modeſty ever ſtopt His Mouth, or ever hindered Him from Writing, as freely as He thought.

SECT.

SECT. IV.

The Third General Defence of Mr. Lock *conſidered.*

YOU again put me in Mind, that I call the Subject of my Sermon the Contentious Part of the Article of the Reſurrection. And You ſuppoſe, I cannot properly call it ſo, but by owning with Mr. *Lock*, that the Scriptures have not determined the Matter; And that therefore, Men are left at Liberty to diſpute, and exerciſe Their Wit about it. I have given You the Anſwer to this Matter already: But becauſe You repeat it, You muſt be content to bear with the Repetition of the Anſwer. This Part of the Article of the Reſurrection was called Contentious, for no other Reaſon, than for which any Truth of the Chriſtian Religion, may be called ſo. A Man's Title to His Eſtate may be very Good, and Clear, and He may have been long in Poſſeſſion of it, and yet crafty, and deſigning Men may bring it into Queſtion, and make it grow a Matter of Contention. In the ſame Manner, the Divine Nature of our Lord *Jeſus Chriſt* was long confeſſed to be clearly revealed, in the Scriptures, and the Church had been long in quiet Poſſeſſion of That Truth; Yet We know, that the *Arian* Hereſy

Hereſy has now made it, and did once before, many Centuries ago, make it, a Subject of Contention. And in like Manner, in theſe Infidel Times, All Revealed Religion is at once made Contentious, by Men, who deny all Revelation, and contend againſt the Divine Authority of thoſe Books, which contain it. In ſhort therefore, when any Doctrine of Scripture is called Contentious, You ought not to ſuppoſe, that 'tis called ſo, becauſe 'tis leſs true, or becauſe, as You ingeniouſly expreſs it, Men are left at Liberty to diſpute, and exerciſe Their Wit about it; but becauſe there are Men vain, abſurd, and Wicked enough, to oppoſe, and contradict it, as Mr. *Lock* has done the Truth of the Reſurrection. For tho' Mr. *Lock* ſays to the Biſhop of *Worceſter*, in the Words, which You cite from Him, "For tho' (*f*) "I do by no Means deny, that the *Same* "*Bodies* ſhall be raiſed at the Laſt Day, yet "I ſee Nothing Your Lordſhip has ſaid to "prove it to be an Article of Faith;" Yet at the ſame Time He is very far from granting any ſuch Thing, as appears from the Paſſages before cited out of Him, and from ſeveral others, which You may conſult, as in the Margin. (*g*) And therefore, You muſt be, either, obliged, to make theſe Words

(*f*) 3 Lett. *p.* 195.
(*g*) 3 Lett. *p.* 199. 200, 201.

con-

conſiſtent with all thoſe Paſſages, or elſe to ſuppoſe that Mr. *Lock* does not ſpeak Here, *abſolutely*, and His real Thoughts, but only with Regard to ſome Paſſages of His *Eſſay*, which the Biſhop had, by Miſtake, applied, to prove the Reſurrection of the *Same Body*; The Firſt, I am ſure, is beyond Your Skill. And if the Latter be the Truth, it is only an Argument, *ad hominem*, and cannot be applied, without Impertinence, to any other Man, but That Biſhop. It is always one Thing, with Mr. *Lock*, not to Deny, and another Thing to Grant. In His *Eſſay*, He had no Occaſion to deny the Reſurrection of the *Same Body*; And This is what He really means, when He ſays, He does not deny it. But, that He does not grant it, appears not only, from the Paſſages before cited, but from the Words He uſes, Here, to the Biſhop, "I ſee nothing Your "Lordſhip has ſaid to prove it to be an Ar-"ticle of Faith." For if He did not grant it to be an Article of Faith, He knew, He need not grant it, at all. Nobody could require His Belief of it. And what He could not be required to Grant or believe, He need not give Himſelf the Trouble to deny. So that, You ſhould have conſidered, a little, the Tendency and Import of Mr. *Lock*'s Words, before You had put one of His Sneers at the Biſhop, upon Your humble Servant, who did Nothing to deſerve it.

SECT. V.

The Fourth General Defence of Mr. Lock *conſidered.*

BUT You go on to ſay, "that Mr. "*Lock* denies the Reſurrection of the "*Same Body*, to be an Article of Faith, be- "cauſe He finds it not, in expreſs Words, "in the Scripture; And that This is All, "that He denies of it; Not offering one "Argument, from Overabounding Reaſon, "againſt it:" Thank You, Good Sir, What could Mr. *Lock* do more, or worſe, than to deny it to be an Article of Faith, or to be found in Scripture? After This, He might ſpare Himſelf the Trouble of producing other Reaſons againſt it. And to what Purpoſe, does He ſay, "that He makes no Dif- "ficulty of believing, that God may, if He "thinks fit, give to every One, at the laſt "Day, a *Body*, conſiſting only of ſuch Par- "ticles, as were before vitally united to His "Soul," while He abſolutely denies, that God has revealed, He will do ſo? We know, as well as Mr. *Lock*, that Articles of Faith can be ſupported by Revelation only, but we cannot think, that it was either Modeſty, or real Submiſſion to the Scriptures, which obliged Him to deny, that the Reſurrection of the *Same Body* had That Support.

port. I am ſure of This, that for a Man to prefer His own private Interpretation of the Scriptures to That of the Univerſal Church, and to make Uſe of Some general Expreſſions in Them, to overthrow the particular Senſe of Them, has very little of the Appearance of Modeſty, or Submiſſion to the Scriptures.

CHAP. II.

The Opinion and Authority of the Ancient Writers *of the Chriſtian Church, as to This Doctrine, Conſidered.*

YOU ask, in the next Place, What Authority I have, or the Biſhop of *Worceſter* had before, to erect This Doctrine of the Reſurrection of the *Same Body*, into an Article of Faith? And in Return I ask You again, Whether You honeſtly think, that the Biſhop was the firſt, that erected it? Or Whether You can name the Time, or the Perſons, who laid the Foundation of it, till You come to *Chriſt*, and His Apoſtles; whoſe Words have been often produced for the Proof of it? You ſee therefore, that the Biſhop, and the Sermon, Both, have groun-

ded this Doctrine, where all Articles of Faith ever were, and muſt be grounded, upon the Scriptures, and the concurrent Belief, and Interpretation, of all Ages, of the Chriſtian Church. And if This be not ſufficient Foundation, I deſire You to ſhew Me a better. The Teſtimony of Ancient Chriſtian Writers is a Sort of Proof Which You ſeem not to be acquainted with; and therefore, with much good Senſe and Modeſty, are pleaſed to call it Oſtentation. I cannot, it is true, charge You with ſuch Oſtentation, when You brave All thoſe venerable Authorities, which have been cited, with the ſingle Name of Mr. *Lock:* But I will have Leave to think, from Thence, that the Vanity and Aſſurance of ſome Men does exceedingly ſurpaſs the Oſtentation of Others.

And yet, after You have thus inſulted theſe Authorities, poſſibly without ſo much as conſulting Them, You ask, very ſecurely, what do They aſſert more, than That the Dead ſhall riſe again with *Their* Bodies? But You are to be told, that Theſe venerable Writers deſpiſe the Shallow Art of covering the Senſe of the Reſurrection with Terms of ſuch Latitude and Ambiguity. It was beneath Their primitive Simplicity, not to expreſs Their Faith diſtinctly. It is a Misfortune to You not to know the generous Plainneſs, and open Inge-

Ingenuity of Their Writings. If You will not therefore be ſo wiſe, as to deſpiſe Things, which I preſume You never read; I will be ſo bold with You, as to repeat the Oſtentation of citing ſome of thoſe Good People; That You may be ſatisfied, They did not ſpeak Mr. *Lock*'s Language. And I hope, You will be ſo modeſt, as to think, That the Argument, from Their Authority, is much ſtronger, than That, from Mr. *Lock*'s. And then perhaps, You may find, that even This Oſtentation is an Argument of more Force, than ever You can anſwer. They ſtand ready for You, in the Margin. (*b*) And

(*b*) Juſtin. Apol. 1. Ed. Oxon. 8vo. p. 14. —— Ἡμεῖς δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ πρᾶγμα φαμὲν γίνεσθαι, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τῦ χριστῦ, καὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς σώμασι μετὰ τῶν ψυχῶν γινομένοις, καὶ αἰωνίαν λύσασιν λυομένοις. —— Here You ſee the Martyr expreſly mentions the *Same Bodies*.

—— p. 36. Οἳ καὶ τὰ νεκρέμενα εἰς γῆν βαλλόμενα πάλιν ἀπολήψαι ἑαυτῶν σώματα προσδοκῶμεν. ἀδύνατον μηδὲν εἶναι Θεῷ λέγοντες.

—— p. 37. Ἀλλ' ὃν τρόπον τὴν ἀρχὴν οὐκ ἂν ἐπιστεύσατε ἐκ τῦς μικρᾶς ῥανίδος δυνατὸν τοιάτης γένεσθαι, καὶ ὁρᾶτε γινομένους. τὸ αὐτὸν τρόπον λογίσασθε, ὅτι διαλυθέντα, καὶ δίκην σπερμάτων εἰς γῆν διαλυθέντα, τὰ ἀνθρώπεια σώματα, καλὸν καιρὸν προσάξει Θεῷ ἀναστῆναι, ἐν ἀφθαρσίαν ἐνδύσασθαι, οὐκ ἀδύνατον. —— You ſee the Martyr ſpeaks here particularly of Bodies diſſolved, caſt into, and ſown in the Earth.

Conſt. Apoſt. L. 5. Cap. 8. — αὐτὸς γὰρ ἡμᾶς ἐγερεῖ ὁ παντοκράτωρ Θεὸς διὰ τοῦ Κυρίε ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῦ, —— ἐν ἀναστάσει ἡμᾶς—τοιούτους ὁποίοι ὑπάρχομεν ἐν τῇ νῦν μορφῇ.

Athe-

You may ſee by Them, if You pleaſe, that They did expreſs more, than that the Dead ſhall riſe again with *Their* Bodies. For that

---

Athenagoras de Mort. Reſur. Ed. 8vo. Oxon. p. 150. Ἀλλ' οὔτε ἀγνοεῖν τὸν Θεὸν δυνατὸν τῶν ἀναστησομένων σωμάτων τὴν φύσιν καί τε μέρος ὅλον καὶ μόριον, οὔτε μὴν ὅποι χωρεῖ τῶν ἀνομοίων ἕκαστον, Καὶ ποῖον τοῦ ὁμοιχείου μέρος δέδεκται τὸ λυθέν, Καὶ χωρῆσαν πρὸς τὸ συγγενὲς καὶ πάνυ παρ' ἀνθρώποις ἀδιάκριτον εἶναι δοκῇ, τὸ τῷ παντὶ πάλιν προσφυῶς ἡνωμένον.

——— p. 151. Ἐν γὰρ μὴ ὅλα καὶ τὴν πρώτην σύστασιν ἐποίησε τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων σώματα, Καὶ τὰς τελῶν ἀρχάς. Καὶ διαλυθέντα, Καὶ ὃν ἂν τύχῃ τρόπον, ἀναστήσει μετὰ τῆς αὐτῆς ἐνεργείας, ἐπίσης γὰρ αὐτῷ καὶ τοῦτο δυνατόν.

Ireneus L. 3. c. 51. ——— Mortalia Corpora Noſtra cuſtodientia Juſtitiam reſuſcitans Deus incorrupta & immortalia faciet ———

——— Cap. 62. Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο πληρωθέντος τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ, ὃν αὐτὸς παρ' αὐτῷ προώρισε, πάντες οἱ ἐγγραφέντες εἰς ζωὴν ἀναστήσονται ἴδια ἔχοντες σώματα, Καὶ ἰδίας ἔχοντες ψυχὰς, Καὶ ἴδια πνεύματα, ἐν οἷς εὐηρέστησαν τῷ Θεῷ.

——— L. 5. Cap. 2. Οὕτως γὰρ τὰ ἡμέτερα σώματα ἐκ αὐτῆς τραφόμενα, καὶ τεθέντα εἰς τὴν γῆν, Καὶ διαλυθέντα ἐν αὐτῇ ἀναστήσεται ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ καιρῷ, τοῦ λόγου τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν ἔγερσιν αὐτοῖς χαριζομένου εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ καὶ πατρός.

Euſebius. Eccleſ. Hiſt. L. 5. Cap. 1. Epiſt. ad Franc. in Aſia & Phrygia de Martyr. ——— τὰ οὖν σώματα τῶν μαρτύρων παντοίως παραδειγματισθέντα καὶ ἀποθριαθέντα ἐπὶ ἡμέρας ἕξ, μετέπειτα καίντα καὶ ἀποδαλωθέντα ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνόμων κατεσαρώθη εἰς τὸν Ῥοδανὸν ποταμὸν πλησίον παραρρέοντα, ὅπως μὴ δὲ λείψανον αὐτῶν φαίνηται ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔτι. Καὶ ταῦτ' ἔπραττον, ὡς δυνάμενοι νικῆσαι τὸν Θεὸν, Καὶ ἀφελίσθαι αὐτῶν τὴν παλιγγενεσίαν. ἵνα ὡς ἔλεγον ἐκεῖνοι, μὴ δὲ ἐλπίδα σχῶσιν ἀναστάσεως.

Cyrillus Hieroſol. Ed. Oxon. Fol. Catec. 4. p. 62. De Reſur. Φείδε μοι παρακαλῶ τῆς σώματος τούτου !!, καὶ γίνωσκε, ὅτι ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγερθήσῃ, μετὰ τοῦ σώματος τούτου κεφθησόμενος, &c. ibid.

——— Cat-

that Expreſſion, as Mr. *Lock*, and You, Uſe it, is ambiguous, and equivocal, and ſignifies only *New* Bodies, which God

——— Cat. 18. — 3. p. 261. Ὁ ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος ἡμᾶς ποιήσας ‖ Θεὸς ἄρα τοὺς ὄντας καὶ πεσόντας ‖ ἐγεῖραι πάλιν ἀδυνατεῖ ; &c. ibid.

I might cite many more of the *Greek* Fathers to this Purpoſe, but Theſe ſhall be ſufficient.

The Latin Fathers ſpeak in the ſame Manner.

Tertulliani Apol. Ed. Lutet. 1641. Fol. *p.* 42.

Certe quia Ratio Reſtitutionis deſtinatio judicij eſt, neceſſariò idem ipſe qui fuerat exhibebitur, ut boni ſeu contrarij meriti judicium a Deo referat. Ideoq; repræſentabuntur & Corpora, quia neq; pati quicquam poteſt Anima ſola ſine materiâ ſtabili ; id eſt, carne, & quod omnino de judicio Dei pati debent animæ, non ſine carne meruerunt, intra quam omnia egerunt. Sed quomodo, inquis, diſſoluta materia exhiberi poteſt ? Conſidera temet ipſum, ô homo, & fidem rei invenies. Recogita quid fueris, antequam eſſes. Utiq; nihil meminiſſes enim ſi quid fuiſſes. Qui ergo nihil fueras, priuſquam eſſes, idem nihil factus, cum eſſe deſieris, cur non poſſis eſſe de Nihilo ejuſdem ipſius Autoris Voluntate, qui te voluit eſſe de Nihilo ?

——— Omnia pereundo ſervantur, Omnia de interitu reformantur. Tu homo, tantum Nomen, ſi intelligas te, vel de Titulo Pythiæ diſcens, Dominus omnium Morientium & Reſurgentium, ad hoc morieris, ut pereas ? Ubicunq; reſolutus fueris, quæcunq; te materia deſtruxerit, hauſerit, aboleverit, in nihilum prodegerit, reddet te.

——— De Reſur. Carnis. *p.* 386. ——— [Deus] utiq; idoneus eſt reficere, qui fecit ; quanto plus eſt feciſſe, quam refeciſſe : initium dediſſe, quam reddidiſſe. Ita reſtitutionem Carnis faciliorem credas inſtitutione. Aſpice nunc ad ipſa quoq; Exempla divinæ Poteſtatis. Dies moritur in noctem, & tenebris uſq; quaque ſepelitur. Funeſtatur mundi honor. Omnis Subſtantia denigratur. Sordent, ſilent, ſtupent cuncta : Ubiq; Juſtitium eſt. Ita Lux amiſſa lugetur : & tamen rurſus cum ſuo cultu, cum dote, cum Sole, eadem integra & tota uni-

ſhall join to the Souls of Men, at the laſt Day; and which both He, and You, very abſurdly, call a Reſurrection. Whereas by

---

univerſo Orbi reviviſcit; interficiens mortem ſuam, noctem, reſcindens Sepulturam ſuam, tenebras, heres ſibimet exiſtens, donec & nox reviviſcat, cum ſuo & illa Suggeſtu ——— Totus igitur hic Ordo revolubilis rerum, teſtatio eſt Reſurrectionis Mortuorum. Operibus eam præſcripſit Deus, antequam Literis: ——— Nec dubites Deum Carnis etiam Reſuſcitatorem, quem omnium nôris reſtitutorem, &c. — * — Etenim quam abſurdum, quam vero & iniquum, utrumq; autem quam Deo indignum, aliam Subſtantiam operari, aliam Mercede diſpungi; ut hæc quidem caro per Martyria lanietur, alia vero coronetur, item è contrario, hæc quidem caro in Spurcitiis volutetur, alia vero damnetur. Nonne præſtat omnem ſemel fidem a ſpe reſurrectionis abducere, quam de gravitate atq; juſtitia Dei ludere?

——— Adverſus Marcionem *L.* 5. *c.* 9. *p.* 592. Et ipſum quod Mortuorum Reſurrectio dicitur, exigit defendi proprietates Vocabulorum. Mortuum itaq; vocabulo non eſt, niſi quod amiſit Animam, de cujus facultate vivebat. Corpus eſt quod amiſit Animam, & amittendo fit mortuum: ita Mortui Vocabulum Corpori competit. Porro ſi Reſurrectio Mortui eſt, Mortuum autem non aliud eſt quam Corpus, Corporis erit Reſurrectio. Sic & Reſurrectionis vocabulum non aliam rem vindicat, quam quæ cecidit. Surgere enim poteſt dici & quod omnino non cecidit, quod ſemper retro jacuit. Reſurgere autem non eſt, niſi ejus, quod cecidit. Iterum enim ſurgendo, quia cecidit, reſurgere dicitur.

Minutius Felix Not. Var. Lugdun. 1672. *p.* 326. Tu perire & Deo credis, ſi quid Oculis noſtris hebetibus ſubtrahitur? Corpus omne, ſive areſcit in pulverem, ſive in Humorem ſolvitur, vel in cinerem comprimitur, vel in nidorem tenuatur, ſubducitur nobis; ſed Deo elementorum cuſtodi, reſervatur. Nec ut creditis, ullum damnum ſepulturæ timemus.

Ruffinus in Symbolum Ed. Oxon. Cypr. *p.* 29. ——— Sed & Apoſtolus cum dicit; Oportet enim corruptibile hoc induere incorruptionem, & mortale hoc induere immortalitatem: Numquid non Corpus ſuum quodammodo contingentis, & digito palpantis eſt Vox? Hoc ergo quod

nunc

by All the Authorities, which I have ſet before You, You may ſee, It was the conſtant Senſe of the Ancients, that the Dead were to be raiſed in the *Same Bodies*, at the laſt Day, in which They lived This Mortal Life before; The very Terms and Senſe, which Mr. *Lock* objects againſt. And We are ſo far from being concerned, that He doth ſo, that We are ſure, His Objections muſt grow mean and contemptible, againſt the Senſe, and Authority of ſo great a Multitude. Who, how meanly ſoever You may think of Their Reaſonings, Yet, as to Matter of Fact, are Unanſwerable Witneſſes of the Faith, and Doctrine of the Church of *Chriſt*, in the ſeveral Ages, in Which They wrote. And this Conſideration alone would overpower

---

nunc corruptibile corpus eſt, reſurrectionis gratiâ incorruptibile erit, & hoc quod nunc mortale eſt, immortalitatis Virtutibus induetur.

Hieron. Epiſt. 61. ad Pammachium ——— Quod dicit Apoſtolus, Corruptibile hoc & Mortale; hoc ipſum corpus, id eſt carnem, quæ tunc videbatur, oſtendit. Quod autem copulat, Induere, incorruptionem & immortalitatem; illud indumentum, id eſt, veſtimentum, non dicit corpus abolere quod ornat in gloriâ, ſed quod ante inglorium fuit, efficere glorioſum. ——— ——— Sed & ipſum Reſurrectionis Vocabulum ſignificat non aliud ruere, aliud reſuſcitari; & quod adjicitur, mortuorum, carnem propriam demonſtrat; quod enim in homine moritur, hoc & vivificatur.

I might cite many other Paſſages from Theſe and Others of the Ancient Writers of the Church, as full, and expreſs, to this Purpoſe, but theſe are ſufficient.

You

You, and Your celebrated Friend, if He had been forty Times greater than He was.

But You are pleaſed to ſay, that Mr. *Lock*'s Senſe of the Reſurrection ſeems, as ſufficient, to ſupport the Martyrs under Their Sufferings, as That of the *Same Body*. If You had conſulted *Tertullian*, in the Place referred to, in the Margin, He perhaps might have offered You ſome Reaſons to think otherwiſe. But the Queſtion was not, what might be ſufficient to ſupport Them; but, What did ſupport Them, under Their Sufferings? And that it was the Faith of the Reſurrection of the *Same Body*, which did ſupport Them, You may ſee in that Part of the Epiſtle of the Chriſtians of *Lyons*, and *Vien*, in *France*, to Their Brethren in *Phrygia*, referred to in *Euſebius*, in the Margin. And there, You will alſo find, as You were told in the Sermon, that it was the Heathen Perſecutors, only, who thought This, Their Senſe of the Reſurrection to be falſe, and ridiculous. The Crown of Glory, revealed to be laid up for the Martyrs in Heaven, might have been ſufficient to ſupport Them, under Their Sufferings, without the Belief of any Senſe of the Reſurrection. But would that be ſufficient Warrant for Us, that They believed none? It is ridiculous

lous to make Suppoſitions, which the bare Relation of the Matter of Fact deſtroys.

But now, if theſe Ancient Writers are allowed to have repreſented truly the Senſe of the Church of Chriſt concerning the Reſurrection, in their ſeveral Ages, (and I am ſure You dare not ſay They did not) Then, it is plain, We have in Them a ſtanding Authority, through many Centuries, and of a publick Nature alſo, to direct Us, how to underſtand the general Expreſſions, both of the Scriptures, and of the *Creeds* of the Chriſtian Church, concerning the Faith of the Reſurrection. For tho' neither the Scriptures, nor the Ancient *Creeds* of the Church, have thoſe very Words, the *Same Bodies*, in Them, relating to the Article of the Reſurrection; Yet, ſince, there are Words of the ſame Senſe, and Import, in Them, which have been by all the Ancient Writers, at ſeveral diſtant Times, and Places, interpreted to ſignify the *Same Bodies*, it is, not only ſafeſt, but our Duty, to conform to the Senſe of Theſe Witneſſes of the Catholick Church, and to underſtand the general Words of Scripture, and of the *Creeds*, in that particular Senſe, in which the Catholick Church has thus, through all Ages, underſtood Them, that is to ſay, of the *Same Bodies*. For this is the ſureſt Way

to

to preſerve the true Faith from being corrupted. Which never happens, but when the Innovations, of ſome Vain, Conceited Man, are admitted againſt the conſtant Senſe, and Interpretation, of the Catholick Church of *Chriſt*. Tho' the Ancient Writers of the Chriſtian Church, therefore, taken ſingly, and ſeparately, muſt be allowed to be but Private Perſons, and conſequently, that, while They are conſidered, only, as ſuch, there appears no Obligation, why We ſhould ſubmit to their Explanations; Yet when They are taken Collectively, and conſidered as a Body of Writers, a Cloud of Witneſſes, atteſting what was the Faith of the Church in their Times, They are a publick Authority, and oblige Us to underſtand the Chriſtian Doctrines in Their Senſe; As We have any Regard to preſerve that *Faith, which was once delivered to the Saints*. When the Ancient Apologiſts therefore, for the Chriſtian Faith, and thoſe Old Writers, who profeſſedly ſet Themſelves to explain their *Creeds*; When They, who in the Eldeſt Times of Chriſtianity, defended the Doctrines of the Church, againſt Heathens, and Hereticks, always, explained Themſelves upon the Article of the Reſurrection, ſo, as to make it plain, that They underſtood it of the *Same Bodies*; What Reaſon can You, or any good Chriſtian have, why

why We ſhould not always underſtand it in the Same Senſe? Since the Faith of Chriſtians ought always to be the ſame. And ſince that Explanation of the Faith ſeems moſt likely to be true, which was received by the Church, in the Earlieſt, and Pureſt Ages of it, neareſt to the Times of Them, that wrote the Scriptures, and from the immediate Succeſſors of the Apoſtles; And, for which, Some of theſe Primitive Explainers ſuffered the Loſs of Life itſelf.

CHAP. III.

Of the Senſe of the Ancient Creeds, *as to this Doctrine.*

YOU ſay, indeed, That the *Creeds* of the Church are the only Explanations of Scripture, that carry any Authority with Them; and that thoſe Words, the *Same Bodies*, are not aſſumed into any of Them; And therefore the Explanations of no Private Perſons, meaning thereby the Primitive Writers of the Church, ought to go further, than the Church in Her *Creeds* hath thought fit to do. Now I will, Here, grant to You, that the *Creeds* do carry in Them the Publick Authority of the Chriſtian Church.

Church. But whether They are, always Explanations of Scripture, as You call Them, may well be queſtion'd. Since They are rather, known to be, Short, General, Heads of Chriſtian Doctrine, gathered out of the Scriptures, and laid together, for the eaſy Inſtruction of Chriſtians, and to expreſs Their Agreement in the Same Faith, againſt Infidels, and Hereticks. And Theſe Short, General, Heads of Chriſtian Doctrine, ſo collected, and laid together, often did, and, of Their own Nature, often muſt, want particular Explanations, according to the Exigencies of the Times, and as Hereſies and Errors, corrupting the Faith, ariſe in the Chriſtian Church. Theſe Particular Explanations, the Ancient Writers now ſet before You, give Us, and particularly upon the Article of the Reſurrection. And as They all agree in the Explanation of That, They are publick Witneſſes of the Senſe of the Church, concerning it. And, I hope, no Good, or Rational Chriſtian will think it, an hard or Unjuſt Impoſition upon Him, that He ſhould be obliged to believe the general Words of Scripture, and of the *Creeds* of the Church, in that particular Senſe, in which the Univerſal Church generally underſtood Them; and eſpecially, in the Firſt, and Pureſt Ages of it. For this is ſure, that, if we will not appeal to this Teſtimony, and Authority, When the Senſe

of

of General Words containing Articles of Faith, in Scripture, or in the *Creeds* of the Church, comes in Queſtion; We ſhall never be able to determine the certain and particular Meaning of Them. Every celebrated Man will be His own Interpreter, and every one, ſo charmed with a celebrated Name, as You appear to be, will blindly follow Him. This, therefore, is an undenyable Reaſon, why We ſhould be guided in our Faith, by the Explanations of thoſe Ancient Writers, whom You have the Aſſurance to deſpiſe. And it is alſo a ſufficient Reaſon, why a good Chriſtian may entertain even a juſt Scorn and Contempt of any particular Man, who ſhall oppoſe His own private Opinion, againſt the Conſent of ſo many Witneſſes of The Faith.

But to come yet nearer to You. Tho' We had No Aſſurance, from Ancient Writers, that the Church underſtood the Article of the Reſurrection, to mean that of the *Same Body*; Yet the Terms made Uſe of in the *Creeds*, to expreſs that Article, are ſufficient Direction to Us, to underſtand it, in That particular Senſe. For I ask any Man, What He can properly and naturally underſtand by σώματος, or σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν, *Corporis*, or *Carnis Reſurrectionem*, but, only, that the *Body*, the *Fleſh*, *This very Fleſh*, and therefore *Body* of Ours is the immediate

ate Subject of the Reſurrection in the Senſe of thoſe *Creeds*? I appeal to any thinking Man, even to You, Yourſelf, Whether by any of thoſe Expreſſions, it can be meant, that at the Laſt Day, the Dead ſhall have *New Bodies* given to Them; Which is Mr. *Lock*'s Explanation of the Reſurrection. The Term, The *Fleſh*, is Here made Uſe of, purely for this Purpoſe, to ſignify, that Men ſhould riſe in the *Same Bodies* in which They lived, and dyed. Not that the Church could be ignorant, that *Bodies*, glorified at the Reſurrection, could not ſtrictly be called *Fleſh*, ſince the Apoſtle ſays expreſsly, that *Fleſh and Blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God*. But no Term could be more proper, and pertinent, than That, to expreſs, in another Word, the Reſurrection of the *Same Body*. Since it is certain, that a Body of *Fleſh* can be only *This Mortal Body*, and if a Man riſes in *That*, He muſt riſe in the *Same Body*.

The Word, *Body*, alſo, if properly underſtood, Here, muſt be ſuppoſed to ſignify the *Same Body*. For Nothing can be more abſurd, than to apply the Idea of the Reſurrection to That of a *Body*, and not to underſtand it of the *Same Body*. Common Senſe, and Language ought, Here, to convince Us, as I doubt not, They did Mr. *Lock* himſelf, when He thanked the Biſhop of

of *Worceſter*, for giving Him Occaſion to know, That Thoſe Words, The Reſurrection of the *Body*, were not to be found in Scripture. And I leave it therefore upon You to conſider, How They came into One of the moſt Ancient *Creeds*; Whether contrary to the Senſe of Scripture; And Whether You can fairly underſtand Them in a Senſe, different from what I have now given?

CHAP. IV.

The firſt Head of the Sermon, Conſidered, and Defended.

I Paſs now, with You, to be more Particular, and to conſider the firſt Head of the Diſcourſe, concerning the *Sameneſs* of Human *Bodies*, as far as You think, Mr. *Lock* is concerned in it.

SECT. I.

Identity *Stated.*

AND Here, becauſe the Scriptures ſpeak with great Plaineſs and Simplicity, according to *Vulgar Notions*, and *Popular Conſiderations*, and were never in-

tended to teach Us Points of *Natural Philoſophy*, I ſay, that Mr. *Lock*'s "*Philoſo-*
"*phical*, and *Abſtracted* Idea of the *Iden-*
"*tity* of a *Body*, is, by no Means, to be
" agreed to, When the *Sameneſs* of the
" Reſurrection *Body* is the Subject of Diſ-
" courſe." Becauſe a *Philoſophical*, *Abſtracted Sameneſs* is not agreeable, ſo much as, to the Nature of Things, and much leſs to the Scriptures. This is, in few Words, the Force and Sum of what is ſaid, under the Firſt Head. Now upon This, You are pleaſed to open with This pleaſant Obſervation, That "Since upon My Rea-
" ſoning, that *Philoſophically*, and *Abſtrac-*
"*tedly* ſpeaking, that is, ſpeaking in a
" Way, neither agreable to the Nature of
" Things, or the Scriptures, a *Body* is not
" the *Same*, if any one Particle be loſt from
" it, therefore *Mathematically* and *Abſtrac-*
"*tedly* ſpeaking, What Mr. *Lock* ſays, may,
" by ſome Means, be agreed to, that the
" *Body* at the Reſurrection will not be the
" *Same* with That, which lived Here, if it
" does not conſiſt of the *Same* Numerical
" Particles." Very pretty. And What then? Mr. *Lock*'s *Abſtracted* and *Mathematical Identity* is by no Means to be allowed, therefore it is by ſome Means to be allowed. Is This Your Logick, or Mine? I reject Mr. *Lock*'s Mathematical *Identity*, becauſe there is no ſuch Thing in the Scriptures,

tures, or in the Nature of Things, but only in the *Ideal World*. And You contend therefore, that in the *Ideal World* it may be admitted. So let it, if You pleaſe, and follow it Thither, as faſt, and as cloſe, as You can: But You are not to expect, that I ſhould go after You. For I expreſsly tell You that This is not the *Identity* of the Reſurrection *Body*; To which You return an Anſwer, That Mr. *Lock* ſays, that the *Identity* of the Reſurrection *Body* muſt conſiſt in the *Mathematical Identity*, or in the *ſame preciſe* Number of Particles; Which without doubt is a very convincing Argument.

SECT. II.

Mr. Lock's Identity *not approved of.*

YOU might have ſpared Yourſelf the Trouble alſo, of telling Me, That Mr. *Lock* always underſtands the *Same Body*, in a Mathematical, and abſtracted Senſe; That He fixed it to This Senſe, in His Philoſophical Work, His *Eſſay*; and That He conſtantly, and ſteddily, uſes it, and would ſtill have done ſo, againſt any other Idea of the *Same Body*. For What is All This to Me, Mr. *Lock* was at Liberty to fix His Idea of *Identity*, as He pleaſed, and to retain it, as long as He pleaſed. And I, or any Man elſe,

may demand the ſame Liberty. And therefore I can ſee no imaginable Reaſon, Why I may not make Uſe of the *Vulgar*, and *Unphiloſophical* Idea of the *Same Body*, ſpeaking of the Reſurrection *Body*, as well as He makes Uſe of the *Abſtracted*, and *Philoſophical*. Eſpecially, ſince the Vulgar is more agreable to Scripture, and the Nature of Things, than the *Philoſophical*. And as for His Agreeing with Me in the Thing, tho' not the Name, I ſhall anſwer That, when it appears.

SECT. III.

The Vulgar *Conſideration of* Identity *moſt proper to be applied to the Reſurrection.*

YOU obſerve, in the next Place, that I ſay, there is an *Identity* by which even a River is the *Same*; upon which You ſagely ask Me, *Same* What Sir? As if it was not plain from the Place, where the Words ſtand, that Nothing could be meant by Them, but *Same* River. For They are introduced in This Manner; "If there be no ſuch Thing, as This Ab-"ſtracted *Identity*, in any other Natural "*Body*, much leſs will it be found in the "Human *Body*, compounded of fleeting "Particles, Senſibly, and Continually, Ex-"haling, and Flowing from it, like the "Waters

" Waters of a River. But as there is an " *Identity*, by which even a River is the " *Same*; So" ——— From whence it appears, that *Identity* is, Here, applied to a River, as a River, and not as a *Body*. The Compariſon of a River being uſed for a proper Illuſtration of the Flowing, Varying, Condition of an Human *Body*; And the *Vulgar*, *Unphiloſophical*, *Sameneſs* of the One, to expreſs the *Vulgar*, *Unphiloſophical*, *Sameneſs* of the Other. Which is the Subject of the preſent Head of the Diſcourſe. And therefore, What Mr. *Lock* would own, is nothing to the Purpoſe. But You are ſo full of His Ideas of the *Same Body*, that You are always putting Them upon Me, whether I will or no; tho' I tell You, I will not accept of Them, upon This Occaſion, but will ſtand by my own, which, I am ſure, are more proper to the Subject in Queſtion. But, You again put another wiſe Queſtion to Me, who has obliged Us to allow any *Sameneſs* at all, to ſuch a Varying, Fleeting, *Body*, as a River, or an Human *Body*? (For Theſe are the *Bodies*, in This Place, particularly mentioned) And I frankly anſwer You, that I know no other Obligations to allow it, but only Thoſe of Common Senſe, and Common Language; by which Men always think Themſelves bound to ſuppoſe, and call, the River *Thames*,

for Inſtance, and every River, the *Same* River, not only, while They run, in Their own Banks, but even out of Them; and to call, and ſuppoſe, Their own *Bodies, the Same Bodies*, from Three to Threeſcore, or from Their Birth, to their Death. This perhaps is not done very *Philoſophically*, or *Mathematically*; but it is all one for That, it is done with very good Senſe, agreably to the Underſtanding of Mankind, and to the Manner of ſpeaking, in the Holy Scriptures. And if I ſhould tell You, I do not know wherein this ſuppoſed *Sameneſs*, according to the common Notions of Men, conſiſts; It would not be in the leaſt Danger of being loſt, for My Deficiency in accounting for it. Men would ſtill think Their *Bodies*, and Rivers, the *Same Bodies*, and Rivers, tho' there were no Philoſopher, no new *Lock* to tell Them, wherein the *Sameneſs* of Them conſiſted. Common Senſe and Obſervation will always be ſufficient for This Purpoſe. And therefore You might have ſpared that other trifling Queſtion. In what does This *Sameneſs* conſiſt? I told You, that any fleeting *Body* is the *Same*, while it is preſerved diſtinct, from all other *Bodies*, of the *Same*, or of a Different Species. This was ſufficient for My Purpoſe, which was to account for *Sameneſs*, according to the *common Notions* of Men,

Men, and not according to *Abſtracted*, and *Metaphyſical* Niceties. And therefore, I paſſed over the Principle of *Individuation*, aſſigned by the Schools; and by Them, after Their Manner, called, *Thiſneſs*, or *Hæcceity*; and told You that it was ſufficient, to know any *Body* to be the *Same*, to know it to be preſerved diſtinct from all others, of the *Same*, or of a different Species. And to know That, We need only to appeal to Common Senſe, and Obſervation. And This, I am ſure, was ſufficient for My Purpoſe: Since it was My Deſign to account for *Identity*, only, by *Vulgar Notions*. So that, All, that I fairly drop'd (as You call it) was only Subtleties, and Fooleries, which had encumbered the Queſtion, in Order to give a plain and rational Account of it. And if This Account appears ſtill Dark, and Confuſed, to You, and beyond Your Depth, (as You tell me) I cannot help it. But, I hope, when You are come out of Mr. *Lock*'s Ideal World, and are acquainted with, and reconciled to Common Senſe, once more, You may ſee clearer into it, and be capable of finding it ſound at Bottom.

You trifle, therefore, ſtill further with Me, when You tell Me, That Mr. *Lock* did not deny the *Diſtinction* of *Bodies*; That Human *Bodies* were diſtinct from

all Others; but That it was not a *Sameneſs*, which preſerved Them ſo. For all This is Nothing to the Purpoſe. You imagine, that every Word I ſay is levelled at Your great Man; But I aſſure You, I had Here Nothing to do with Him. I deſire only to keep to the Notions of *Common Senſe*, and leave You to enjoy the *Metaphyſicks* of Your Friend. Yet I can ſometimes ſee, when Thoſe Niceties are without Truth, and Foundation. As for Inſtance, When You tell Me, that "every Human *Body*, from the firſt Moment "of its Vital Union with the Soul, is, by "its Exiſtence in that Union, and Organization of Life, diſtinguiſhed from All "others". You place the particular Diſtinction of every Human *Body*, in a *vital Union* with the *Soul*, which is not ſtrictly true. For tho' This makes it an Human *Body*, yet it does not make it an Human *Body*, particular to itſelf, and diſtinct from All others. All Human *Bodies* have This in general, and in Common, that They are United to the Soul; But the *Particularity*, and *Diſtinction*, of each of Them, depends upon ſomething elſe, that is to ſay, upon the *Sameneſs* of Them, or that Principle of *Individuation*, which diſtinguiſhes Them from All others. But enough of This, ſince it is not to our general Purpoſe.

SECT.

SECT. IV.

This, *different from Mr.* Lock's *Identity.*

I Paſs next to conſider with You, whether Mr. *Lock* and I differ only in Words, and agree in Things? For That You tell Me, You ſhrewdly ſuſpect: Having firſt with great Gravity, and Contempt, called My State of the Nature of the *Sameneſs* of Human *Bodies*, a weighty Conteſt. But, I aſſure You, I intended no further Conteſt in it, than only to ſtate it different from Mr. *Lock*, that is, not after a *Philoſophical*, and *Abſtracted* Manner, but agreably to the *Common Notions* of Men. The Firſt, You have hitherto allowed, and contended to be His State of the Thing; and the Other, You may perceive, and I have told You often, is Mine. But now of a ſudden, Mr. *Lock* and I it ſeems are *perfectly* agreed. Let Us ſee how, and in what? Why, You tell me, that I ſay, that "the Human *Body* is compounded "of Fleeting Particles, continually exha-"ling, and flowing from it, ſo that it "cannot be imagined, for any little Time, "to conſiſt of the *Same*, Numerical Par-"ticles". Thoſe Words, one would think, ſhould be hardly reconcileable with Mr. *Lock*'s *Mathematical Identity*, which conſiſts

ſiſts of the *Same, Preciſe, Numerical* Particles. But They are not in the leaſt contrary to that *Vulgar Identity*, which I am eſtabliſhing, and which I ſuppoſe to be conſiſtent with a Fleeting, Varying Condition. However You prove it, Becauſe Mr. *Lock* ſays, You tell me, that the *Body*, which a Man has at Fifty, is not the Same, with That, which He had at Five or Fifteen: That is, as He explains Himſelf, it does not conſiſt of the *Same*, Individual Particles of Matter. (*i*) Now I beg Leave to ſay, that a Man ſo poſitively given as You are, and Who inſiſts ſo much on Expreſs Words, ſhould not have varied from the Text of Your Friend, and have given Us other Words, than His. Yet allowing Your Expreſſions to be His Senſe, I do not ſee, what They are to the Purpoſe of our Agreement, except You can find any Agreement between My ſaying, that a *Body* may be the *Same* by a *Vulgar Sameneſs*, tho' it cannot be imagined for any little Time to conſiſt of the *Same* Numerical Particles; And Mr. *Lock*'s ſaying, that a Man has not the *Same* Body at Fifty, which He had at Five, or Fifteen, becauſe it does not conſiſt of a *Mathematical Sameneſs*, The *Same*, Individual Particles of Matter, at

(*i*) 3 Lett. p. 172.

thoſe

thoſe different Ages: Which, You know, is What He requires to make the *Same* Body. Theſe Two Propoſitions ſeem to Me, directly to oppoſe and contradict one another. And ſure, it will be a very hard Task upon You, with all Your Shrewdneſs, to form an Agreement between Contradictions. But You are ſtout, and go on with repeating my own Words, as They ſtand in the Margin, (*k*) which imply, that as a Living Human *Body* is looked upon to be the *Same*, by a *Vulgar Sameneſs*, tho' it is in a continual Ebb and Flow of Matter, and therefore, cannot have always the *Same, Preciſe*, Number of Particles: So at the Reſurrection, it muſt be ſuppoſed alſo, to have the *Same, Vulgar Identity*, tho' new Particles of Matter ſhould be added to the old. And with This Senſe of My Words, You tell me, Mr. *Lock* perfectly agrees, in another Place of his Third Letter. (*l*) You were ſo much in Haſte to conclude the Agreement between Us, that

(*k*) "Thoſe Parts of the old Matter, which belonged to "the Human *Body*, before Death, be They more, or leſs, "which it pleaſes God to reſtore to Life, at the Reſurrection, will be ſufficient, whatever new Particles may "be added, to make it as much the *Same* with That, which "Died, as That which Died, was, with That, which Lived "before; Or That, which Lived before, was, for any little "Part of Time, the *Same* with itſelf. *Serm.* p. 8.

(*l*) P. 180.

You

You miſtook the Occaſion of His Words, which are not, as You ſay, upon thoſe of St. *Paul, That every one may receive the Things done in His Body, according to That He hath done.* (*m*) But upon another Paſſage of that Apoſtle's, *If there be no Reſurrection of the Dead, then is Chriſt not raiſed.* (*n*) However, His Words are Theſe. "But why with remaining Particles of a "Man's *Body*, long ſince diſſolved, and "mouldered into Duſt, and Atoms, (where-"of poſſibly great Part of it may have un-"dergone Variety of Changes, and entered "into other Concretions, even in the *Bo-"dies* of other Men) other new Particles "of Matter, mixed with Them, may not "ſerve to make *His Body* again, as well "as the Mixture of New and Different "Particles of Matter with the Old, did, in "the Compaſs of His Life, make *His Body*, "I think no Reaſon can be given. —— "Since whatever Matter is vitally united "to His Soul is *His Body*, as much as is "That, which was United to it, When "He was born, or in any other Part of "His Life". Now I will confeſs to You, that at firſt Sight, there does ſeem to be ſome Agreement between the Senſe of theſe

(*m*) 2 Cor. 5. 10.
(*n*) 1 Cor. 15. 16.

Words,

Words, and Mine; and if I could think the Agreement would hold further, I ſhould not be aſhamed to own it. But I ask You Yourſelf, whether You can think, that Mr. *Lock* intended, in theſe Words, to expreſs fully, and perfectly, the ſame Senſe with Mine, ſetting, only, aſide the Conſideration of *Sameneſs*, or *Identity*, after You have Conſidered with Me,

Firſt, THAT what He ſays Here, is in Anſwer to a particular Objection, concerning the raiſing of Men, with the *Same Bodies*, as *Chriſt* was raiſed with the *Same Body*; And therefore is not ſaid generally, and poſitively of all Human *Bodies* at the Reſurrection; but only, occaſionally, and to avoid the particular Force of That Argument. And His Way of Expreſſing Himſelf is doubtful, and uncertain, Why ſuch a Thing may not be, I think no Reaſon can be given.

Secondly, THAT the Reaſon He gives for His Poſition in His laſt Words in this Place, That "Whatever Matter is vitally "united to a Man's Soul is *His Body*, as "much as is, That, which was united to "it, when He was born", will hold good, if an entire *New Body* were given Him, at the Reſurrection, as well as if ſome New Particles were mixed with, or added to, the

the remaining Old, in it. And therefore that the Word *HIS* is equivocal, and is capable of being extended further, than I can allow in the Reſurrection *Body*.

Thirdly, THAT whatever Agreement Mr. *Lock*'s Words may ſeem to have with Mine, in This Place, yet in other Places, He drops the Mixture of New, and Old Particles, in the Reſurrection *Body*, and ſpeaks of the Reſurrection *Body*, as of a *New* one, to be united to the Soul, which would be, as much the *Body* of the Dead, as the Old one would be, if raiſed; as You know very well; and as You may ſee, in the Places referred to, in the Margin. (*o*) So that, upon all theſe Conſiderations, I think I have Reaſon to expect, that You ſhould allow, That the Agreement between Mr. *Lock*, and Me, is very far from being *perfect*, as You call it; That it is only *Appearing*, and *Occaſional*, and *Partial*; That His Meaning is, not only, to ſet aſide the Belief of the Reſurrection of the *Same Body*, in his own Senſe of *Same Body*; but to introduce alſo a Belief, that a *New Body*, united to the Soul, at the Laſt Day, may be properly a Reſurrection *Body*. For which Reaſon, no Doubt, it is, that He rejects All *Same-*

(*o*) 3 Lett. p. 196, 209, 210.

neſs,

neſs, but His own, That, which conſiſts in the *Same* Numerical Particles, the *Ideal Identity*. And when All *Sameneſs* is ſet aſide, but That, which never was in Nature, then, of Courſe, a *New Body* united to the Soul, notwithſtanding the Abſurdity of Words, muſt be the Reſurrection of the Dead. And therefore when You prove to Me, that the Senſe of My Words runs equal to All This, Then, I will own an Agreement with Mr. *Lock*, and not before. The Truth is, that I have, ſtrictly ſpeaking, no Conteſt with Mr. *Lock*, about the *Sameneſs of Bodies*; He ſtates His Idea of the *Identity* of Them, *Metaphyſically*, as He pleaſes, and I, *Vulgarly*, as I thought neceſſary, upon the Conſideration of the Reſurrection. I differ from Him without diſputing with Him, and eſtabliſh a *Sameneſs*, which I think proper to the Senſe of Scripture, without offering any Thing to deſtroy His; but only ſaying, I cannot agree to it, or by no Means, agree to it, which Expreſſions I, innocently, intended to mean all one Thing; tho' You learnedly have ſuppoſed otherwiſe. And therefore, if any Thing falls from Mr. *Lock*, which ſeems ſometimes, to You, to agree with My Senſe of *Same Body*; You ought not to imagine, that I have any Conteſt with Him about *Sameneſs*; but that Force of Truth compelled Him, now, and Then, to ſay the Same as I do, tho' He would acknow-

knowledge no *Identity* but His own. And while He acknowledges no *Sameneſs* of *Bodies*, but His own, and thereby leaves, not only Room to ſuppoſe, but many clear Intimations, that the Dead may be raiſed with *New Bodies*, which are neither the *Same* in His own, nor in any other Senſe, This is not a Diſpute, merely, about Words, as You haughtily think; An Article of Faith is concerned in it; The Belief of the Reſurrection of the *Body*, the *Same Body*, as I ſuppoſed it is ſufficiently revealed in Scripture. And upon Your Appeal to Me, I cannot but declare, that this Management of Mr. *Lock*'s tends to ſubvert the Faith, and is a ſly, and artificial Denyal of the Article of the Reſurrection. And ſuch a Denyal deſerves, I think, All the Exclamations, I have beſtowed upon it. It is an Impertinence therefore to ask, Whether I do not as much deny the Reſurrection of the *Same Body*, in Mr. *Lock*'s Senſe of the *Same Body*, even, as He does. For where did I ever give You Occaſion to think otherwiſe? But when You ſay, that Mr. *Lock*, by denying the Reſurrection of the *Same Body* to be an Article of Faith, means only to deny, that the *Body* ſhall be raiſed with the *Same*, Numerical Particles, This is groſs Prevarication: For He ſometimes means, that the Dead ſhall be raiſed, by having Their Souls united to *New Bodies*, and therefore in no

Senſe

Senſe the *Same* with the Old; And This You know well enough.

SECT. V.

This Identity, *not entirely different from the Biſhop of* Worceſter's.

YOU go on to tell Me, that "if Mr. "*Lock* had owned the Faith of the "Reſurrection of the *Same Body*, in My "Senſe of *Same Body*, yet He could not "have paſſed for Orthodox with the Biſhop "of *Worceſter*." This, I think, is beyond Your Skill to be ſure of. For how can You tell, whether the Biſhop might not have approved of an Opinion, ſo natural, and obvious, to the Common Senſe of Mankind, ſo agreable to the Scriptures, and which could give Him no Jealouſy, or Suſpicion, that any new Doctrine concerning the Reſurrection, ſuch as That of Mr. *Lock*, That *New Bodies* ſhould be given to the Souls of Men at the Laſt Day, was intended to be advanced by it? For tho' the Biſhop does inſiſt, that the *Body*, at the Reſurrection, ſhall be reſtored out of the *Same* Particles, which have been formerly united to the Soul, and no other; Yet a *Body* ſo reſtored cannot be called, *Mathematically*, and *preciſely*, the *Same*, with That which lived, that is, in Mr. *Lock*'s Senſe of *Sameneſs*; but in

my Senſe, that is, in a *Vulgar* and *Unphiloſophical*, it may, and therefore, if Mr. *Lock* had been of the Faith, which I defend, the Biſhop and He had not been ſo far aſunder, as You imagine.

SECT. VI.

Nor, from the Ideas of Identity *commonly received.*

AND as for Thoſe well meaning Men, whoſe Learning and Labours in explaining the Difficulties of the Reſurrection, tho' ſometimes mixed with Impertinences, are yet much above Your trifling, and prophane Raillery, I ſay, how My Opinion, in Mr. *Lock*'s Mouth, might have been received by theſe Men, it may not perhaps be difficult to ſuppoſe. Since (if They had no Suſpicion for the Sake of the Perſon, who ſhould have propoſed it) a Doctrine, ſo agreable to Their own Explanations of the Reſurrection, and which only differs from Theirs, by being more expreſs, and clear, concerning the *Sameneſs* of Human *Bodies*, could not, but have been very acceptable to Them. So that if ſome Charm, as You ſpeak, had not bound You over Body and Soul to Mr. *Lock*, You would not, for His Sake, have imagined, Three diſtinct Senſes, of the Reſurrection of the *Same Body*, where there

there really is but one, which the Biſhop, and all other Learned Men, and Catholick Chriſtians, as well as myſelf, have ever agreed in; That the Reſurrection *Body* is the *Same* with That, which lived before; Not by having the *Same* preciſe Number of Particles, but by ſuch an *Identity* of Parts, and Particles, as is ſufficient to denominate it the *Same* now, in the Common Opinion of Men. And This Senſe of the Reſurrection of the *Same Body* is ſufficiently expreſs, and determinate, and will effectually cut off That Rakiſh Liberty, which You, or any one elſe, may be inclined to take, of underſtanding Your *Creed* in any Senſe, (as You expreſs it) You, or He pleaſes. The Caſe therefore, happens to be quite otherwiſe, than You have ſtated it. The Reſurrection, of the *Same Body*, is ſtill underſtood in the *Same*, Uniform Manner, tho' perhaps conſidered, now, in a more clear, and diſtinct Light; Nor do I differ from, or innovate upon, the Biſhop, or any other Aſſertor, of the Doctrine of the Reſurrection of the *Same Body* in any Thing material to That Faith. But if I had enlarged the meaning of the Term, the *Same Body*, beyond Them, as You ſay, I do, I could be glad to ſee, how You would make good Your ridiculous Conſequence upon Me, that Then, Others, with Your Friend in the Head of Them, may go further, and maintain, that a *Body* may be

as well the *Same* with the Old *Body*, at the Reſurrection, which is all over entirely *New*, to a Particle, as a *Body* which conſiſts for the moſt Part of Particles, entirely Old, and Remaining. For this is certainly a very merry Conſequence, If a *Body*, which has ſome Particles the *Same* at the Reſurrection, which it had before, may properly be called the *Same Body* with the Old; therefore a Body, which has no Particle the *Same* with the Old, may be called the *Same Old Body*. This is charming Logick; And by the ſame Way of Reaſoning, it will be as eaſy to prove, that tho' a Man is provided with *New* Cloaths ever ſo often, yet He never wears but one Suit, becauſe if He will be ſo impudent as to ſay, that His Cloaths are the *Same*, after having been once *Mended*; Another will go further, and ſay, that a *Fire-New Coat*, and for the ſame Reaſon, Two or Three *New* Coats are ſtill the *Same* Suit. So that how acute ſoever Your Sight or Penetration, in other Matters, may be, It ſeems Here to have failed You very much. For while You are Here Childiſhly ſtraining for Proof, that I am making an Article of Faith of a mere Sound, You have run Yourſelf into very Subſtantial Nonſenſe.

SECT.

SECT. VII.

The Advantages of ſtating Identity *in This Manner, conſidered, and defended, in Oppoſition to Mr.* Lock's *Notion of it.*

BUT however, You condeſcend at length to grant, that the Way of explaining the *Sameneſs* of Human *Bodies*, by This Vulgar, and Unphiloſophical *Identity*, and which You are pleaſed very decently to ſneer, becauſe I called it plain, and eaſy, does deliver Us from Many Difficulties raiſed (for that is the Duſt I mean) concerning the Reſurrection *Body*. Yet ſtill You are at a Loſs to find, how it overturns, or delivers Us from, Mr. *Lock*'s Scheme of the Reſurrection; Which, Unhappily for Myſelf, (for You lay it ſadly upon my Conſcience) I had called open Scepticiſm, and ſecret Infidelity, confounding *Identity*, and Perſonality, and Unknown Reſurrection of Perſons.

Now, *Firſt*, As to Mr. *Lock*'s Scepticiſm. This You know ſignifies Uncertainty of Opinion; and That Mr. *Lock*'s Opinion about the Reſurrection was Uncertain, is manifeſt, not becauſe, He does not determine of what Particles the *Bodies* ſhall be made up, at the Reſurrection,

which is all the Scepticiſm, You can think of, in Him, and therefore kindly ſuppoſe it none at all; But becauſe He ſpeaks of the Reſurrection, in ſuch general Words only, as if Men were to be raiſed from the Dead, without having any *Body* raiſed. (*p*) Or as if a *New Body* given, were a *Body* raiſed. Or that if the *ſame* Perſons appear before the *Judgment Seat of Chriſt, to anſwer for what They have done in Their Bodies*, This would be as properly a Reſurrection, as if the Dead were raiſed, in Their old *Bodies*; tho' according to Him, Men are Perſons only by Their Souls. This is Mr. *Lock*'s Scepticiſm concerning the Reſurrection; And it is open, and avowed; And whether a Man, who ſpeaks ſo Looſely, and Uncertainly, of this Article of Faith, may not be juſtly ſuſpected, really not to believe it at all; or to be a ſecret Infidel, in this Reſpect, let any impartial Chriſtian judge. For my Part, I am ſure, it can do no Violence to My Conſcience to ſpeak the Truth; And I am as ſure that I do not find, I have ſaid any Thing but the Truth, concerning Your celebrated Friend, when I charged Him with Scepticiſm, and Infidelity. But now That any Man will be left under theſe Uncer-

(*p*) 3 Lett. *p.* 209, 196, 205.

tainties,

tainties, Doubts, and Suſpicions, who receives the Faith of the Reſurrection of the *Same Body*, under thoſe common Notions, which all Men have of the *Sameneſs* of Human *Bodies*, and as it has been underſtood in the Catholick Church, and is now by Me ſtated, I defy, even You Yourſelf to ſay. For Here, We are fixed to proper Ideas of the Reſurrection; to the Raiſing again of that, which was fallen down; to the Raiſing of the *Body*, the *Same Body*, in all Mens Senſe of the *Same*; And without which There can, in no Propriety, be a Reſurrection, with whatever Awe, and Chriſtian Senſe, a Man may talk of a Future Life.

Secondly, The Confounding *Identity*, and Perſonality of Mr. *Lock*, which, I ſay, the Belief of the Reſurrection of the *Same Body*, in my Senſe, delivers Us from, or clears Us of (for I have no Reaſon to be aſhamed of that Expreſſion) was intended, by Me, to Mean, not His confounding one of thoſe Ideas with the other, as You miſtake Me, but the miſchievous Conſequences, and Confuſions, of His applying His Philoſophical Ideas of *Identity*, and Perſonality, to the Reſurrection. For thereby He endeavours to prove, not only, that the Reſurrection of the *Same Body* is impoſſible to be maintain'd, but alſo, that

the Reſurrection of Perſons, that is, the Appearance of Souls, at the Tribunal of *Chriſt*, in another Life, is ſufficient. And from theſe Conſequences, and Confuſions, The Belief of the Reſurrection of the *Same Body*, in mine, and the Common Senſe of Mankind, ſets Us clear.

And therefore, *Laſtly*, I ſay alſo, that We are cleared from Mr. *Lock*'s Unknown Reſurrection of Perſons. For the Reſurrection of Perſons is an Expreſſion, which was never known before Mr. *Lock* uſed it. And He does make Uſe of it, ſeveral Times, in one Page, tho' it ſeems, it eſcaped Your diligent Search, particularly *p*. 205. He has Theſe Words. "I affirm, "that the ſame Perſons ſhall be raiſed —— "There can be Nothing Plainer, than "That in the Scripture it is revealed, that "the Same Perſons ſhall be raiſed". (*q*) Now This New Language would be ſtrange, in any Man, But out of Mr. *Lock*'s Mouth, a Man, who would not allow any Doctrine to be revealed in Scripture, that is not There in expreſs Words ſet down, it would be very unaccountable, if it were not plain, that He had a Turn to ſerve by it. Which was to ſet aſide the Belief, of the Reſurrection, of the *Same Body*. And therefore,

(*q*) 3 Letter.

by

by aſſerting the Reſurrection of the *Same Body*, tho' We deny not that the Conſcious Principle, in Man, ſhall anſwer for the Things done in the *Body*; Yet ſince it is Mr. *Lock*'s Opinion, that Men are Perſons by that Principle only; and conſequently the Appearance of Perſons to be judged in the other Life, tho' called by Him a Reſurrection, may be only the Appearance of the Souls of Men: Chriſtians are fixed to a Belief, that a Reſurrection is properly That of the *Body*; and that the Reſurrection of Perſons is a looſe, and equivocal Expreſſion, and the pure Invention of Your celebrated Friend, which obliged Me to call it His *Perſonal*, or His own Invented Reſurrection.

CHAP. V.

The Paſſages of Scripture, produced in the Sermon, for the Reſurrection of the Same Body, *conſidered, and defended.*

AND now I paſs with You to the Second Enquiry of the Sermon, which is This. How far the Scriptures declare to Us, that the Riſing *Bodies* of Men, ſhall be the *Same* with Thoſe that dyed.

SECT.

SECT. I.

Of the Senſe, and Expreſſions of the Scripture, in general.

AND, Here, You begin with ſuppoſing, that the Scriptures have declared Nothing particular about This Doctrine, for this very particular Reaſon, Becauſe You have ſhewed, that the Aſſertors of it have underſtood the Words, as You expreſs Yourſelf, without ſaying, what Words, tho' I ſuppoſe You mean the Words of Scripture, in different Senſes. But it is Your Misfortune to be miſtaken, when You ſay, You have ſhewed This; for You have ſhew'd no ſuch Thing. And ſuppoſe You had ſhew'd it; Is it a ſufficient Proof, that a Doctrine is not in the Scripture, becauſe They, who aſſert it, may happen to differ, a little, concerning the Senſe of the Words of Scripture, which They ſuppoſe to contain it? If it be, there would be very few Doctrines capable of being proved from Scripture; ſince Interpreters, who believe the ſame Doctrines, do very often differently expreſs Themſelves, in explaining the Words, which contain Them.

IN the next Place, You ſuppoſe alſo, that You have ſhewed, That there is little Difference

ference between Mr. *Lock*'s Meaning, and Mine, Which I preſume, I have made appear to be another great Miſtake in You. However, it was certainly in your Power, to have ended Your Diſpute with Me, as ſoon as You pleaſed. And I thank You, That You ſay now, You would not think it neceſſary to go along with Me, if it were not in Defence of, and to be aiding and aſſiſting to, Your great Man. For at firſt, You talk'd, that Love of Truth, and Concern for the Intereſts of Religion, had engaged You to write; But now Theſe are little Things, in Compariſon of Your Deſire, to ſupport the Reputation of Mr. *Lock*. And with all my Heart, ſupport it, as well as You can.

You proceed therefore, with obſerving, that under This Head I have Theſe Words. "Where the Doctrine is entirely Matter of "Faith, and Revelation, There the Words, "and Expreſſions, of the Scriptures are, "principally, to direct, and govern ours". Upon which You remark, that "it were "to be wiſhed, I had kept cloſe to That "excellent Rule", implying by This Wiſh, that I do not always confine Myſelf, in ſpeaking Here of the Faith of the Reſurrection, to the very Words, and Expreſſions of Scripture. And can You ſay, That the Obſervation of This Rule will oblige

Me

Me to it? May not the Words, and Expreſſions of the Scriptures be truly ſaid to direct Mine, When My Senſe agrees with Them, tho' My Words differ from Them? Nay, except my Words differ from Thoſe of the Scriptures, how can it be poſſible for me to give, or explain the Senſe of Them? Since Where Words are of General, or Uncertain Meaning, as They often are in the Scriptures, It is impoſſible, that the Repetition of Them, as They ſtand, ſhould explain Them. When therefore, I ſay, that the Scriptures do directly lead us into This Belief, That the Riſing *Bodies* of Men ſhall be the *Same*, with Thoſe that Dyed, tho' I do not intend, that They do expreſly, and in ſo many Words, affirm it; Yet, if They contain This Senſe, I am as much obliged to be directed by it, in My Words and Expreſſions, as if They did, in expreſs Terms, affirm it, according to That well known Rule, *Senſus Scripturæ eſt Scriptura.* And Whether There are not Expreſſions, and Paſſages, in the Scripture, whoſe Natural and Genuine Senſe, without any Force, or Violence, done Them by Interpretation, will lead us to think, that the *Same Bodies* ſhall riſe again at the Reſurrection, We ſhall now proceed to examine.

SECT.

SECT. II.

The Firſt Text for the Reſurrection of the Same Body, *produced in the Sermon, Conſidered at large, and the Application of it, Defended.* Rom. 8. 11.

MR. *Lock* had affirmed, in the Place cited above, and as You cite His Words, that "the Reſurrection of the *Body*, "much leſs, of the *Same Body*, is not "mention'd in Scripture, where the ge-"neral Reſurrection is ſpoken of". This was a bold Affirmation, and therefore to ſhew the Falſeneſs, and Confidence of it, it was confronted in the Sermon with Theſe Words of the Apoſtle. *He, that raiſed up Chriſt from the Dead, ſhall alſo Quicken your Mortal Bodies, by His Spirit, that dwelleth in You* (r). It cannot be denyed Here, that the *Body* is expreſly mention'd under the Character of *Mortal*, and if the Word, *Quicken*, be uſed to expreſs the ſame Senſe with, *Raiſe*, it is certain Here is a Paſſage expreſs for the Reſurrection of the *Body*, which, Mr. *Lock* affirms, is not to be found in it. You think it hard, that Your Friend ſhould be charged,

(r) Rom. 8. 11.

with

with ſuch a groſs, and barefaced Falſehood, and therefore tell me, that "to make good "This Imputation, I ſhould have produced "a Text of Scripture, where Theſe very "Words, *The Reſurrection of the Body*, "are uſed, and where the General Reſur-"rection is *Undeniably* ſpoken of." But why ſo? Was it not the *Body*, which was the Subject of Diſpute? And is it not ſaid Here, that *Bodies* ſhall be *Quickened*? A Word of the ſame Signification, and Import, as *Raiſed*. And do not both Theſe join'd together, very fully, and perfectly, expreſs, *the Reſurrection of the Body*? No, ſay You, They are not the very Same Words. But it is the very Same Senſe, and That is as bad for You as the Same Words. And This Your Maſter *Locke* apprehended well enough; tho' You do not; Or elſe, He had not added This, His other Limitation, to His Affirmation, "Where the Reſurrection at the laſt "Day is ſpoken of," nor endeavour to explain it away from That Senſe, as He does in His Comments.

BUT Here, to make ſure Work, You thruſt in a Word of Your own, to mend even the wary Limitation of Your exact Friend, and to His Condition, That "the "general Reſurrection be ſpoken of," You add, and require for Him, That it be, *Undeniably*, ſpoken of, which is both Unreaſonable,

ſonable, and ridiculous. For will it not be ſufficient, that it can be proved, that 'tis ſpoken of, Tho' not ſo peremptorily, as That no Body can deny it? For what Text of Scripture is there, of which it can be ſaid, that no Body can deny a Particular Senſe of it, tho' ever ſo Plain? ſince a Plain Senſe may be underſtood Figuratively. And What Text can be produced, as ſpeaking *Undeniably* of the Reſurrection, if ſuch Men as Mr. *Lock* and Yourſelf, could deny it to be ſpoken of, in it? For this Paſſage You Both deny, to ſpeak of the General Reſurrection. But when You deny it, You are able to give it no other Meaning than a figurative. For This is Manifeſt, and Undeniable, that the *Quickening* a Man to *Newneſs of Life*, or a *Life of Righteouſneſs*, is a Secondary, and Tranſlated, or Figured Senſe of the Words, *Shall Quicken Your Mortal Bodies*. The Firſt, and plain Senſe of which is, ſhall make alive the *Bodies* of Men ſubject to Death. And therefore, ſince Mr. *Lock* throws Theſe Words into a Figured Meaning, I do Him no Injuſtice, whatever You may think, when I ſay, that He does Them Violence. Since a Figured Senſe of the Words is manifeſt Violence, where the Firſt and Simple Senſe will ſtand good, and the Secondary is not neceſſary, or required. And that the Firſt and Simpleſt Senſe of This Paſſage will ſtand good, I will now endea-

vour

vour to prove. And This I ſhall do Two Ways. Firſt in General. And Secondly, more Particularly and at Large.

Now, Firſt in General, Suppoſing the Words of This Paſſage, *Rom.* 8. 11. to have a Figured, or Metaphorical Meaning, and That by *Quickening Their Mortal Bodies* the Apoſtle meant, Reſtoring Them to a *Life of Righteouſneſs*; I would fain know of You, or any of Mr. *Lock*'s Friends, what This Metaphor is borrowed from. Is it not Manifeſtly taken from the Reſurrection, according to the Scripture Notion of it? And if it was not the true Senſe of the Scripture, that the *Bodies* of Men ſhould be raiſed at the Laſt Day, but only the Perſons of the Dead, Would He not rather have ſaid, ſhall *Quicken You*, inſtead of, *ſhall Quicken Your Mortal Bodies?* If *Bodies* have no Concern in the literal Reſurrection, They would never have been nam'd in the figurative Reſurrection, or the *Quickening unto Newneſs of Life.* It would therefore be but a ſmall Point gained to Mr. *Lock*'s Cauſe, ſhould it appear, that the Reſurrection of the *Body* is not expreſsly mention'd in Scripture.

But, Secondly, ſuppoſing, tho' not granting, that Spiritual Renovation were one View of *St. Paul*, in that Phraſe of *Quickening*,

kening, does that neceſſarily exclude the natural Senſe of the Word, from being, at the ſame Time, the Intention of the Apoſtle? Might not He promiſe Them Both under the ſame Expreſſion? Seeing the Reſurrection to eternal Life, in the next World, was the certain, and neceſſary, Conſequence of riſing to a *Life of Righteouſneſs* in This World. But that the *Life of Righteouſneſs* was no Way intended by the Apoſtle Here, ſeems to be clear, becauſe one cannot ſuppoſe That, without concluding that the Roman Converts were yet *Dead in their Sins*. For whatever the Senſe of *Quickening* might be, it is certain, that the *Romans*, when St. *Paul* wrote This Epiſtle, were not *Quicken'd*, in the Intention of that Phraſe, in This Place. It is promiſed to Them, as an Happineſs, Future. Now between being *dead in Sins*, and *Quicken'd unto Righteouſneſs*, there is, I think, no poſſible Medium. If therefore, hereafter, the *Romans* were to riſe in *Newneſs of Life*, They muſt, as yet, have been *dead in Sin*. And ſurely, from hence it is, that when the Apoſtle clearly applies the Expreſſion of *Quickening*, in a Figurative Senſe, to Chriſtians, He ſpeaks of it, as of a Thing already paſt, *viz.* Coloſ. 2. 13. And *You*, ſays He, *being dead in Sins, and in the Uncircumciſion of your Fleſh, He*, (i. e. the Father) *hath Quickened together with Him* (viz. the Son) συνεζωοποίησε

σὺν αὐτῷ, *having forgiven You all Sins.* So alſo, *Eph.* 2. 5. Thoſe, therefore, who were *Quickened,* according to the Figurative Uſe of That Word, in St. *Paul*'s Epiſtles, are always ſuppoſed, previouſly to ſuch *Quickning,* to be *dead in Their Sins, alienated from the Life of God,* to which Life They are reſtored by Admiſſion into the Covenant of *Chriſt.* They are *Quickened* by the Forgiveneſs of thoſe Sins, the Dominion and Guilt whereof had made Them Spiritually Dead. It will be difficult for You to find any other Figurative Senſe of the Word, *Quicken,* in St. *Paul*'s Writings, but This. If therefore the Paſſage before Us, *Rom.* 8. 11. is to be expounded Figuratively, the *Romans,* to whom St. *Paul* addreſſes Himſelf, were Then *Dead in Their Sins;* They, not having yet been Spiritually *Quicken'd;* were in an Unconverted State; They had not dyed, nor riſen again with *Chriſt,* in Baptiſm; But They are promiſed the Attainment of That Bleſſing, Hereafter. But now, This is utterly inconſiſtent with the Character of the Perſons, to whom St. *Paul* writes that Epiſtle. They were owned, by Him, to be πλυτοὶ ἅγιοι in the Beginning of it, and Their Faith is ſaid to be celebrated all the World over. And in the Reaſonings of the 6th Chapter, They Are ſtill ſuppoſed to have been baptized, and in the 11th Verſe, to be *dead unto Sin, and alive unto God;*

God; and in the 13th Verſe of the ſame Chapter, to be *alive from the Dead*, which is the very Spiritual *Quickening* contended for, in this Place, *Rom.* 8. 11. But if the *Romans* were already alive, in the Spiritual Senſe, in that 6th Chapter, St. *Paul* cannot deſign to promiſe Them That Bleſſing as to come, in the 8th Chapter. To *Quicken* Men unto a *Life of Righteouſneſs*, Who already have That Life, is manifeſtly needleſs, as well as abſurd. It only remaineth therefore, that the *Quickening* promiſed to the *Roman* Converts, in This Paſſage, *Rom.* 8. 11. was the Reſurrection of Their *Bodies*, at the Laſt Day, Becauſe They were already *Quickened*, in every other Senſe, of That Word, that can be found in St. *Paul*'s Writings. Being already *Quickened* in the Metaphor, all Future *Quickening* muſt be Literal; And conſequently, That *Quickening* mention'd in This Place, *Rom.* 8. 11.

And now, from This Firſt, and General Proof, that the Words ought to be underſtood Literally, I proceed

Secondly, To be more Large, and Particular. The Sermon affirms only, that "the "Apoſtle's Diſcourſe in This Place is not, "in the leaſt, foreign to the Mention of "the Reſurrection; That in Theſe Words, "He ſpeaks of *Chriſt*'s, and our own Re-

" ſurrection ", without ſtaying to inſiſt upon the particular Proof of it. For, in ſuch Diſcourſes, it is neither Uſeful, nor indeed poſſible, to be elaborate, and exact, upon every Paſſage of Scripture. The Time allotted for Them, and other Conſiderations, which require to be ſpoken to, will not permit a Preacher to be over-Particular. Before a Learned Audience eſpecially, it might leave upon Him the Imputation of Impertinence. A Man of Your compaſſionate Judgement might have done one the Favour to conſider Theſe Things; and then, You might have ſpared Yourſelf the Trouble of beſtowing a Page or Two of cool Conſiderations upon Me, eſpecially ſince I am now ready, at Your Call, to defend, and explain My Affirmations.

But *Firſt*, I ſhould have been glad to have known, who Your Learned Commentators, and Able Divines, are, who with Mr. *Lock* underſtood theſe Words, in a Senſe quite different from the Reſurrection of the Laſt Day. But either You are aſhamed to diſcover Your Company, (and Some of Them, I preſume, You may be aſhamed of) or elſe, You are ſo Modeſt, that You were afraid it would be Oſtentation to produce Their Authorities, and ſo I was not to be ſo happy; Or, perhaps

haps it may be more juſt to ſuppoſe, that You take Mr. *Lock* alone to be equal to Them All, and therefore ſet up Him, by Himſelf, againſt All Others, and Him therefore I will Now conſider.

But how little ſoever You may value any Authority but Mr. *Lock*'s, it is ſure, that the whole Stream of Commentators, Ancient and Modern, except ſome of the *Socinians*, *Calvin*, and *Piſcator* run directly againſt Him; And of Theſe Two, in particular, *Piſcator* gives no Reaſon for His Opinion, which He took up, in Submiſſion to the Judgement of *Calvin*, whoſe Words You may ſee in the Margin (*s*). He tells Us, that by *Mortal Bodies* We are to underſtand, Whatever remains ſtill in Us obnoxious to Death. Which may be granted, ſince our Souls are not obnoxious to Death. And therefore, our *Mortal Bodies* contain All, that remains in Us, obnoxious to Death. He tells Us alſo, that it is the Apoſtle's Uſual Manner, to call the groſſer Part of Us by

(*s*) Calvinus in Locum — Mortalia Corpora vocat quicquid adhuc reſtat in nobis Morti obnoxium. Ut mos illi uſitatus eſt craſſiorem noſtri Partem hoc nomine appellare. Unde colligimus, non de ultimâ Reſurrectione, quæ momento fiet, haberi Sermonem, ſed De continuâ Spiritûs Operatione, quæ reliquias Carnis paullatim Mortificans, cœleſtem Vitam in nobis inſtaurat.

That Name, the Name of *Body*; And we alſo grant Him This, for the *Body* every one grants is the groſſer Part of Us. But what then? Hence, ſays He, We collect, that the Laſt Reſurrection is not ſpoken of. Fine Reaſoning This! The Apoſtle by *Mortal Bodies* underſtands whatever remains ſtill in Us obnoxious to Death; Therefore the Laſt Reſurrection is not Here ſpoken of. Yet ſo *Calvin*, one, I doubt not, of your Able Divines; And perhaps He was ſuch, whatever He appears Here. But if Your other be no better, much good may They do You. Your Friend Mr. *Lock* would have been aſhamed of Them; and ſo I am ſure You ought to be. I might now tell You, that the Ancient Fathers, *Irenæus*, (*t*) and *Tertullian*, (*u*) *Chryſoſtome*, (*v*) *Oecumenius*, (*w*) and *Theophylact* (*x*) underſtand the Words, in the ſame Senſe, as I do. But Theſe good Gentlemen, I know You deſpiſe. However Thus much may be inferred from the Authority of theſe Ancient, and truly celebrated Names, when added to the General Voice of the Moderns,

---

(*t*) Irenæus L. 5. c. 7.

(*u*) Tertullian Ed. Rigalt. Lut. 1641. De Reſur. Car. p. 414. Adv. Marc. Lib. 5. p. 603. Adv. Prax. p. 661.

(*v*) Chryſoſt. in Locum.

(*w*) Oecumenius in Locum.

(*x*) Theophyl. in Locum.

that an Opinion, which They All give into, concerning the Senſe of the Words of This Paſſage, is not likely to be forced, and unnatural. And when We have not Truth of our Side, to oblige Us to diſſent from Them, it can never be Modeſty to diſſent from Them.

But We will now conſider the Words Themſelves, *Rom.* 8. 11. *He that raiſed up Chriſt from the Dead, ſhall alſo Quicken Your Mortal Bodies.* Theſe are the Apoſtle's Words. And They ſeem to be more peculiarly recommended to our Notice, by being ſet down Twice together in this Sentence. And This may be ſaid of Them, at firſt View, that, if When St. *Paul* ſays, *He that raiſed up Chriſt from the Dead*, He ſpeaks of the Reſurrection of *Chriſt's Body*, Not of His Soul; it ſeems very unlikely, that, when He ſays, *He ſhall Quicken Your Mortal Bodies*, He ſpeaks not of the Reſurrection of Their *Bodies*, but of Their Souls.

But I ſhall enter into the Conſideration of the Words more diſtinctly, that the Dependance, and Connexion of Them, with what goes before, and follows after Them, may be conſidered, and underſtood.

THE Tenth Verſe of this Eighth Chapter is connected with the Sixth Verſe of the Seventh Chapter. All between is a Digreſſion, in Anſwer to the Difficulty, ſuppoſed at Verſe the Seventh of the Seventh Chapter. In the Seventh Chapter, the Apoſtle proves to the *Jews*, that They themſelves, as well as the *Gentile* Chriſtians, were no longer obliged to obey the *Law of* Moſes. And the Phraſe, *Being in the Fleſh*, at Verſe the fifth of this Seventh Chapter, ſignifies, being under the Obligations of That *Law*. This Proof goes as far as Verſe the Sixth, and Theſe Words. *But now, We are delivered from the Law, That being dead, wherein We were held, that We ſhould ſerve in Newneſs of Spirit; and not in the Oldneſs of the Letter.* After which Words, we may immediately ſubjoin Thoſe at the Beginning of this Eighth Chapter, of which, I will now give the Paraphraſe, and of all that follow, to Verſe the fourteenth.

ROMANS Ch. 8.

V. 1. *THERE is therefore now no Condemnation to Them, which are in Chriſt Jeſus, who*

V. 1. THERE is therefore now no Obligation upon Chriſtians to obſerve the Ceremonial

walk not after the Fleſh, but after the Spirit.

nial Law, and no Condemnation, if they obey it not, upon Condition, that They forſake the Luſts of the Fleſh, and conform Themſelves to That Purity of Life, which the Goſpel of Chriſt requires.

2. *For the Law of the Spirit of Life hath made Me free from the Law of Sin and Death.*

2. For the Goſpel of Chriſt will ſet all ſuch Chriſtians, as conform to it, free from the Power of Sin, and from Death alſo, the Puniſhment of Sin, tho' the Law, as is ſaid above, could not.

3. *For What the Law could not do, in that it was weak thro' the Fleſh, God ſending His own Son in the Likeneſs of ſinful Fleſh, and for Sin, condemned Sin in the Fleſh.*

3. The Law had not This Power, the Luſts of Men break thro' That; but under the Goſpel, God found a Means ſufficient to overpow'r all Their Luſts, and to break the Tyranny of Sin and Death, by ſending His own Son, in

in Human Nature, to ſuffer for the Sins of Men. And to ſhew Them, what Severity their Sins deſerved.

4. *That the Righteouſneſs of the Law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the Fleſh, but after the Spirit.*

4. And ſo that Purity, which the Law required, is accompliſhed in Thoſe, who renounce the Works of the Fleſh, and live in Conformity to the Purity and Spirit of the Goſpel.

5. *For They that are after the Fleſh, do mind the Things of the Fleſh; but They, that are after the Spirit, the Things of the Spirit.*

5. For Men under the Power of Senſual Luſts have no Inclination further than to indulge and gratify Them; but ſuch as give themſelves up to the Conduct of the Spirit of Chriſt, and the Goſpel, are conſtantly governed by the Purity, and Sanctity of it.

6. *For to be carnally minded is Death, but to be ſpiritually minded*

6. And the different Iſſue, which attends Theſe Two Sorts

minded is Life and Peace.

Sorts of Men is This. Thoſe, that purſue Their ſenſual Luſts, bring thereby the Puniſhment of Death upon Themſelves; And They, who conform with the Purity, and ſpiritual Nature of the Goſpel, will obtain for Themſelves eternal Life, and Peace with God.

7. Becauſe the Carnal Mind is Enmity againſt God, for it is not ſubject to the Law of God, neither indeed can be.

7. For a Mind given up to Senſual Luſts is in a State of direct Hoſtility againſt God, is too headſtrong to be confined to His Commands, and too ſtubborn to be governed by Them.

8. So then, They, that are in the Fleſh cannot pleaſe God.

8. And therefore, it is not to be expected, that the *Jews*, Men ſubject not only to the Impotency of the Law of *Moſes*, but alſo, to the Power of their own

own Luſts, ſhould be accepted with God.

9. But Ye are not in the Fleſh, but in the Spirit. If ſo be, that the Spirit of God dwell in You. Now if any Man have not the Spirit of Chriſt, He is none of His.

9. But You, Chriſtians, have the Happineſs of being free from Both Theſe Subjections, if the Spirit and Purity of the Goſpel influence, and conduct You; And if They do not, You are not in Truth, and Reality, Chriſtians.

10. And if Chriſt be in You, the Body is dead, becauſe of Sin; but the Spirit is Life, becauſe of Righteouſneſs.

10. But if You be ſincerely ſuch, and are conformed to the Spirit, and Purity of the Goſpel of Chriſt; then, tho' Your Bodies ſuffer Death, the Puniſhment of Sin, Yet Your Spiritual Part ſhall be happy, in a bleſſed Life, for ever, as a Reward of Your Faithful Obedience.

11. But if the Spirit of Him that raiſed up Jeſus from the Dead, dwell in You, He

11. And ſince, as You are Chriſtians, the Bleſſed Spirit, who raiſed up Your Lord

He that raiſed up Chriſt from the Dead, ſhall alſo Quicken Your Mortal Bodies, by His Spirit, that dwelleth in You.

Lord Jeſus Chriſt from the dead, dwells alſo in Your Bodies, Thoſe Bodies, alſo, ſubject to Death, and now tending to it, ſhall, when Dead, be raiſed again, to poſſeſs an immortal, glorious Life.

12. *Therefore, Brethren, We are Debtors, not to the Fleſh, to live after the Fleſh.*

12. Wherefore, Chriſtian Brethren, as You have any Concern for the eternal Welfare both of Your Souls and Bodies, remember theſe Obligations to forſake All Habits of Sin, and ſenſual Luſts.

13. *For if Ye live after the Fleſh, Ye ſhall dye; But if Ye, thro' the Spirit, do mortify the Deeds of the Body, Ye ſhall live.*

13. And that, if Ye live under the Dominion of the Law, which forbids All Sin, but aſſiſts You to ſubdue none, and indulge in All the Sins, which That Law forbids, You muſt certainly bring Death and Deſtruction upon Yourſelves; But if

This

if by the Aſſiſtance of the Spirit of Grace, Ye conform Your Lives to the Purity of the Goſpel, Ye ſhall, both in Body, and Soul, obtain, and enjoy a never-ending Life.

THIS Paraphraſe, I doubt not, will to any Unprejudiced Man appear juſt, and natural, and agreable to the Scope, and Tendency of the Apoſtle's Reaſoning, in this Chapter, and in Others going before it, in this Epiſtle.

I Shall now, in the next Place, take Leave, after the Example of Mr. *Lock*, to ſhew, how this Verſe is introduced by, and connected with, What goes before it. It is the Apoſtle's Deſign, in the Beginning of what He writes, Here, to the Chriſtians at *Rome*, to ſhew, that there was no *Law*, neither That of *Moſes*, nor any other, by which, either the *Jews*, or *Gentiles*, could be juſtified, and accepted before God: But That all Men were capable of This Grace, by the Faith of the Goſpel, and in *Jeſus Chriſt* alone; And that the *Gentiles* had as good a Claim to it,

it, by the Faith of the Goſpel, as the *Jews* themſelves. This is the Subject of the Four Firſt Chapters.

He proceeds in the Fifth Chapter, to open This further, by ſhewing, that as Death was appointed by God, to be the Puniſhment of Sin; So *Jews* and *Gentiles*, who were both alike ſubject to it, could only by *Chriſt*, and by Faith in Him, be reſtored to Life. And therefore, that the Salvation both of *Jews* and *Gentiles* is the Work of Grace alone.

In the Sixth Chapter, He ſhews, that tho' the Deliverance from Death, the Puniſhment of Sin, was entirely Grace alone, Yet, that Chriſtians were not excuſed, by the Grace of the Goſpel, from Purity, and Sanctity of Life. If They were ſtill Servants of Sin, under the Goſpel, They ſhould ſtill fall under the Puniſhment of it, Death; But if They conformed Themſelves, in Their Lives, to the Purity of the Goſpel; Their Obedience ſhould be rewarded with eternal Life.

In the Seventh Chapter, therefore, He addreſſes Himſelf to the *Jewiſh* Chriſtians, among the *Romans*, and tells Them, that They had no Reaſon, ſince They profeſſed the Faith of the Goſpel, to think Themſelves

ſelves any longer under the Obligations of the *Law of* Moſes, and by way of Digreſſion, that it was neceſſary, that that *Law* ſhould be laid aſide, ſince it could not deliver Any Man from Sin, or Death, and that the Deliverance from Them was to be had only from the Grace of *Jeſus Chriſt*.

And then, in This Eighth Chapter, He returns to His former Diſcourſe, and proceeds to ſhew, that neither *Jews*, nor *Gentiles*, were in any Danger of Condemnation, for the Neglect of the *Law*, if They conformed themſelves to That Evangelical Obedience, which the Goſpel required of Them; And This therefore He preſſes upon Them from the ſtrongeſt Arguments, which the Satisfactions of pleaſing God, and the Hopes of a glorious Reſurrection from Death, and immortal Life, could give Them. And then, He goes on to fortify Them with Theſe Hopes, againſt the Afflictions of This Life, which bear no Proportion with the Glories of the next.

This is the Sum of All the Apoſtle's Reaſonings to the End of this Chapter. So that, I may ſay once more, that there is manifeſtly no Neceſſity of underſtanding St. *Paul*'s Words, now under Enquiry, in a Figurative Senſe. Since They are more Natural, and Pertinent to His Purpoſe, and

to the Tendency of His Diſcourſe, in Their Firſt and ſimple Meaning, as They have been generally underſtood.

And as it is plain, that the ἄρα νῦν in Verſe the Firſt of This Chapter, (not οὖν, as it is printed in Mr. *Lock*'s Notes,) is Here allowed its due connecting Force, with Verſe the Sixth of the former Chapter without turning the Senſe of Verſe the 11th, from ſpeaking of the Reſurrection of the Dead; So it is clear, that St. *Paul* conſtantly keeps Life, and Death, in the View of Them, that He writes to, the One as the Puniſhment of Sin, and the Other as the Reward of Evangelical Obedience.

The frequent Antitheſes, He makes Uſe of, in His Diſcourſe, turn upon the Oppoſition between Theſe Two, all thro' This Chapter. So Verſe the Second, He oppoſes the *Law of the Spirit of Life, to the Law of Sin and Death.* Verſe the Sixth He ſays, *to be carnally minded is Death, to be ſpiritually minded is Life.* Verſe the Tenth, *The Body is dead, the Spirit is Life.* Verſe the Eleventh, *He that raiſed up Chriſt from the Dead, ſhall alſo Quicken Your Mortal Bodies.* Verſe the Thirteenth, *If Ye live after the Fleſh, Ye ſhall dye, If Ye mortify the Deeds of the*

Body, Ye ſhall Live. So that after ſo much Mention of *Life* and *Death*, in the firſt, and obvious Senſe of Them, it ſeems very Unreaſonable, and without any Foundation, to alter the firſt Senſe of *Quickening*, or *giving Life to*, only in This one Place.

It is certain, that the General Reſurrection of the Dead is ſpoken of in This Chapter, at Verſe 23. in that Expreſſion, *Waiting for the Adoption, to wit, the Redemption of our Body.* And Mr. *Lock* himſelf allows it in His *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity* (*y*) notwithſtanding what He tells the Biſhop, that the Reſurrection of the *Body* is not to be found in Scripture; And tho' in His Paraphraſe, He takes no particular Notice of it. And why it ſhould not be underſtood to be ſpoken of, Here, I ſee no ſufficient Reaſon to conclude, Notwithſtanding All Mr. *Lock* has ſaid, as I ſhall now ſhew, particularly, in Anſwer to His large Note upon the Place.

1. For *Firſt*, as for the Correſpondence between this Chapter and the Sixth, to Verſe the Fourteenth, to which Mr. *Lock* refers, I grant, that the Apoſtle does, in that Chapter, inſiſt, that Chriſtians are, by no Means, allowed, by the Grace of the

(*y*) Reaſ. Chriſt. *p.* 206.

Goſpel,

Goſpel, to live in Sin, expreſſing himſelf in figured Language, ſuch as, *dying to Sin*, and *being alive to God*. But this is no neceſſary Ground to infer, that therefore this particular Expreſſion, *ſhall Quicken Your Mortal Bodies*, is only a figured Expreſſion for *Newneſs of Life*, for the General Reaſons given, at firſt, above. Becauſe, it is manifeſtly againſt St. *Paul*'s Intention Here to ſignify, that His *Roman* Converts were either Perſons *dead in Sins*, or not *Quickened* to *Newneſs of Life*. The Character He gives Them, in the Addreſs of His Epiſtle, ſhews, They were not the firſt. And the future Promiſe that is made by the Tenſe, *ſhall Quicken*, ſhews They were not the Second.

2. And for the Inference, from Verſe the Eleventh, contain'd in Verſes the Twelfth, and Thirteenth, there is not the leaſt Neceſſity of ſuppoſing His Senſe, of the Eleventh Verſe, to be true, to give the proper Senſe to Them. As appears in the Paraphraſe above So that Mr. *Lock* might wonder as He pleaſed, that the Learned Commentator differed from Him, but it had been really much more Wonderful, if any Man, of That Character, had agreed with Him. The Reaſons He has already given, for denying the General Reſurrection of the Dead to be ſpoken of, in the

Words under Conſideration, appear but Weak; Let us conſider,

3. In the next Place, What He offers for His own Senſe of Them, and againſt the Opinion of His New Adverſary. He ſays "that it cannot be proved that St. *Paul* "ſpeaks Here of the Reſurrection, at the "Laſt Day, except θνητὰ can be proved to "ſignify the ſame with νεκρά. And this "is not to be done, ſince θνητὸν is never "in the New Teſtament, attributed to "Things void of Life; but, always, to "Something living". But, it is ſure, that This Reaſoning is not good. For as θνησέδιον is explained in *Suidas* by τὸ νεκρὸν, and θνητίδια in *Heſychius* by νεκρίμαια, Words very near of the ſame Import with θνητὸν and νεκρὸν; So, tho' a *Body* is truly *Mortal* which is now Living; but is ſubject, and always tending to Death; and ſo θνητὸν, is, indeed, attributed to ſome living Subject; Yet the Conſequence is falſe, that the Reſurrection at the Laſt Day cannot be ſpoken of θνητὰ σώματα. For I ask, whether the Reſurrection be not ſpoken of, 1 *Cor.* 15. 53. *This Mortal muſt put on Immortality*, τὸ θνητὸν τοῦτο is, here, certainly the Expreſſion for That *Body*, which ſhall *put on Immortality*. And Yet I believe, no Man will pretend, that it ought to be rendered by Mr. *Lock*'s witty Tranſlation,

ſlation, *This Living, Dead, Body.* For θνητὸν ſignifies a Being in a Capacity, and under a Law of, Death. And What Abſurdity can it be, that it ſhould be Revealed, that a Being, ſubject to ſuch a Law, ſhould be ſet free from it, and *Quickened* to Immortality?

4. The next Queſtion Mr. *Lock* puts is, "How the Reſurrection of the Dead can "be brought in into This Place, and What "Coherence it can have with St. *Paul*'s "Diſcourſe Here?" But in Anſwer to This, I only refer to the Paraphraſe above, in which it appears to be very properly, and indeed very neceſſarily, joyned, with what goes before, and after. And I take the Same Liberty He does with His Commentator to ſay, tho' without His Air of Confidence, that the Mention of the Reſurrection not only makes very good Senſe Here, but ſuits All that Cloſeneſs of Arguing, which Mr. *Lock* juſtly attributes, when no Body denies it, to St. *Paul.* That it neither gives Him any Start from His Purpoſe, nor breaks the Strength, nor darkens the Light of His Argument: As will appear to any Man, that reads the Paraphraſe, or even the Words of the Apoſtle, without Mr. *Lock*'s Spectacles. Who, when He is moſt ſtraining St. *Paul*, to ſerve His own Turn, always cries out loudeſt, againſt

ſerving Hypotheſes, and Opinions of the Seaſon, tho' His own Hypotheſis is one of the Worſt, that ever was invented, and never can be ſeaſonable: And the other, which He oppoſes, always was, and I hope, ever will be, in Seaſon.

5. THE laſt Reaſon Mr. *Lock* mentions, why This Text ought not to be underſtood of the Reſurrection of the Dead, is "becauſe What is promiſed in theſe Words, "*ſhall quicken Your Mortal Bodies*, is "promiſed, only, to Them, who have "the Spirit of God, and muſt be there-"fore peculiar to Them. Whereas the Re-"ſurrection from the Dead is not. For "God will raiſe the *Bodies* of Wicked Men, "as well as of Believers". But to This I anſwer, That St. *Paul* is addreſſing Himſelf here to Saints, and Thoſe that have the Spirit of God, is true, And for that Reaſon the Reſurrection to Life, or the giving Life to the Bodies of ſuch Saints, ſignifies, the raiſing Them to eternal Life, and immortal Happineſs; which the Wicked cannot be ſaid to be raiſed to; ſince theſe two Reſurrections are expreſly diſtinguiſhed in the Scripture *John* 5. 29. *They that have done good,—unto the Reſurrection of Life, and They that have done evil,—unto the Reſurrection of Damnation.*

Mr.

Mr. *Lock* concludes with referring to ſeveral Paſſages of St. *Paul*'s Epiſtles, where Expreſſions, like This, *of Quickening Your Mortal Bodies*, are uſed figuratively. But I have already given ſufficient Anſwer to theſe Places in the general Reply made, at firſt, with Relation to this Paſſage above, And therefore I need not repeat it.

And now, upon the Whole, tho' I have been very long in ſtating the Senſe of This Paſſage of Scripture, and in reſcuing it from Mr. *Lock*'s Miſinterpretation, and the falſe Grounds, upon which He founds it; Yet I do not think the Pains ill-beſtowed, ſince now, upon a thorough Examination, I doubt not, but it appears, that the Affirmations of the Sermon are good ſtill; And that it is Your celebrated Friend, who proves at laſt, as You call it, the moſt Unlucky in preſſing Words of the Apoſtle into His Service; which, inſtead of being of Uſe to Him, are ſtill directly againſt Him. And therefore, I can't help it; The Imputation of being without Truth, and Modeſty, muſt continue ſtill upon Him, as He denies, that the Reſurrection of the *Body* is in the Scriptures, or that St. *Paul*, in this Place of it, ſpeaks of the Reſurrection of the *Body*.

SECT. III.

The Second Text Conſidered, and Defended, Phil. 3. 21.

I Paſs now with You to conſider the next Paſſage of Scripture, which was urged, in the Sermon, to prove the Reſurrection of the *Same Body*. It was ſaid before, in the Sermon, that "it will appear "from the Expreſſions of the Scripture, "that They do directly lead us into This "Belief". In Proof of This, I cited the Paſſage of St. *Paul*, which we have juſt now, at large, conſidered. And proceeding to cite others, I ſay, "This is not the "only Place of Scripture, where expreſs "Mention is made of *Raiſing, Quickening* "the *Mortal Bodies*", ſuppoſing This Place to be One. And I have proved it to be One. For having proved it to ſpeak of the general Reſurrection, Mr. *Lock* himſelf, I preſume, would not deny, that the Reſurrection of the *Body* was to be found in Scripture, ſince *Mortal Bodies* are Two of the expreſs Words for the Subject of the Reſurrection; And *Quicken*, or *Make alive*, ſignifies the ſame Senſe with *Raiſe*. I ſay, it may be preſumed, that Mr. *Lock* would not have trifled ſo much, as to deny the Thing, and Senſe, when there wants but

but one Word to expreſs, even to a Letter, as I may ſay, the Sentence, and Doctrine, which He required. But You, it ſeems, are ſtiffer; You are not willing to allow, that the Mention of the Reſurrection of the *Body* can be, any Way, expreſſed in Scripture, except the very Words to a Tittle, *the Reſurrection of the Body*, or the *Same Body* be found There. This, I have ſeveral Times told You, is unreaſonable, and unjuſt. Since if there are Words to be found in the Scripture, which ſignify ſo much; or even from which it may be clearly, and neceſſarily inferred, the Doctrine is undeniably founded in Them; and may be ſaid to be mentioned, in the Expreſſions of Scripture, tho' the very Words, which You require, are not There. In ſhort, it is the Doctrine, and Senſe of Scripture, which We contend about, and not bare Words.

And therefore, when You tell me, that the Paſſage, which I cite from St. *Paul*, is oddly choſen for an expreſs Mention, You trifle with Me about Preciſeneſs of Words, when the Senſe of the Place, manifeſtly relates to the Reſurrection of the *Body*. And the Words themſelves, by their proper Conſtruction, ſignify and imply it. The Words are Theſe, *Phil.* 3. 21. *The Lord Jeſus ſhall change our vile Body, that*

It

It may be faſhioned like unto His glorious Body. For I ask it of You, Can You deny, that theſe Words are ſpoken of the Reſurrection at the laſt Day? There can, I preſume, be no Queſtion, that by our vile Bodies St. *Paul* certainly underſtood the Bodies, which He, and the *Philippians*, then had; And He ſays of Theſe, that They ſhall be *changed*. But when ſhall This wonderful *Change* be effected? The immediate foregoing Verſe tells Us. Then, when the Lord *Jeſus* ſhall *Quicken*, or *Raiſe* it, And that will be, when He comes to judge the World. The Word *Raiſe* is not indeed here, but it is manifeſtly, and neceſſarily, implyed. For the Words are Here ſpoken of Thoſe, who had a *Citizenſhip in Heaven*, and conſequently of all Faithful, and Holy Perſons, in general; as well of Thoſe, that were *fallen aſleep in Chriſt*, as of Thoſe, who ſhall be *alive*, at His coming. And if ſo, the *Bodies* of the Dead muſt be raiſed, to be capable of the *Change*, here mentioned, as well as the *Bodies* of the Living Saints, are to be cloathed upon with Immortality. You ſeem indeed to ſuppoſe, that the *Change*, which the Apoſtle ſpeaks of, in This Place, may not relate, at all, to the *Bodies* of Thoſe, who are to be raiſed from the Dead. Becauſe the Apoſtle ſays, in another Place, That They are to be *changed*, who are not to dye,

dye. (z) *We ſhall not all ſleep, but we ſhall all be changed.* But give Me Leave, Sir, here, to conſider the Force of theſe Words. It is manifeſt, that the Apoſtle, Here, diſtinguiſhes between the Saints that are *Dead*, or *Aſleep*, and the Saints that are *Living*. Of the *Dead* Saints He ſays, οἱ νεκροὶ ἐγερθήσονται ἄφθαρτοι, *the Dead ſhall be raiſed incorruptible*; Of the *Living* He ſays, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀλλαγησόμεθα, *And we ſhall be changed.* But the *Change*, both of the *Dead*, and of the *Living*, was to be the *Same*, and the *Mortal*, and *Corruptible*, in Both, was to put on *Incorruption*, and *Immortality*. For ſo it follows at Verſes the 53d, and 54th, of the ſame Chapter, where the τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο, and the τὸ θνητὸν τοῦτο, clearly comprehends the *Bodies* both of the *Living* Saints, who are to be cloathed upon with Immortality, and the *Bodies* of the *Dead* Saints, who are to be raiſed in the ſame Glory. So that the *Change* equally affects, and is to be underſtood of, Both, in both Theſe Places. And then Let me ask You further, Whether This Conſequence may not be good upon You? If All ſhall not *ſleep*, but All ſhall be *changed*, *Dead* and *Living*, into the ſame *Immortality*; then, not only They, which

(z) 1 Cor. 15. 51.

do

do not *ſleep*, but the *Dead* alſo, which do *ſleep*, ſhall be *changed*; And if the *Dead* alſo ſhall be *changed*, it muſt be at the Reſurrection; And if even the Vile *Bodies* of the *Dead* ſhall be *changed* at the Reſurrection; then it is plain Here is another Text of St. *Paul*, which aſſerts the Reſurrection of the *Body*. And ſo, the Parallel Paſſage, which You bring as an Objection, is a Confirmation of the true Application of This Paſſage of St. *Paul*.

I fear, therefore, that I have ſpoiled You for a Wit, upon the Uſe of the Word, *Change*, which the Apoſtle here gives Us. You will forgive Me. It is only the Credit of a Pun which You loſe; and which never is thought to deſerve more than to be laugh'd at. And I could afford to laugh at Yours. But methinks, in a Solemn Man, as You are, and while You are ſpeaking ſerious Things, ſuch Provocation to Merriment looks awkward, and childiſh. And I would recommend to You, the Advice that was given by a Grave Man, to One ſometimes troubled with ſuch Flights, That above all Things He ſhould avoid being Witty, for This Manifeſt Reaſon, becauſe it was a Million to one, if He had any Wit at all.

But however You ſay, "'tis plain, That "this Text does, no Way, contradict what "Mr. *Lock* has aſſerted, and You ask alſo, "Did He ever deny, that our *Bodies* ſhall "be *changed* at the Reſurrection"? I an-"ſwer,

Firſt, Mr. *Lock*'s Aſſertion is, That the Reſurrection of the *Body* is not to be found in Scripture. This is the Queſtion in Hand; and ſince I have proved, that the Words under Conſideration manifeſtly relate to, and imply, the Reſurrection of the *Body*, They are a direct Anſwer to, and Confutation of That Aſſertion. To Your Queſtion I Anſwer,

Secondly, That tho', perhaps, Mr. *Lock* never did deny, in Words at Length, that our *Bodies* ſhould be *changed* at the Reſurrection, Yet This is a neceſſary Conſequence, that if He denied the Reſurrection of the *Body*, He denied that our *Bodies* ſhould be *changed* at the Reſurrection; Since it is manifeſt, that the Apoſtle aſſures us, that our *Bodies* ſhall then be *changed*. And I leave it to You, to conſider, whether Mr. *Lock*, when He denies, that the Reſurrection of the *Body* is ever mentioned, in Scripture, does not deny, the Reſurrection of the *Body*.

But

But You take Your Leave of This Text with telling Me, "You ſhould have been "more ſurprized to find it brought as a "Proof of the Reſurrection of the *Same* "*Body*, if I had not told You before, that "the greater *Change* a *Body* undergoes, it "is the More proved to be ſtill the *Same*; "which, You ſay, is uſing the Word, (*Same*, "I ſuppoſe, You mean) in a very large "Senſe". Certainly, Sir, You muſt be a Man very liable to be ſurprized, if the Proof of the Reſurrection of the *Body*, from This Text, is capable of ſurprizing You. Did You ever ſee it produced againſt This Doctrine? Or can You ſay it was ever urged otherwiſe, than for it? I am glad, that any Words of Mine, ſhould be able to bring You to Your Temper again. But the Words You attribute to Me are really not in the Sermon. For the Words there are Theſe, "The great *Change*, the Human *Body* ſuf-"fers in Death, and the greater, it muſt un-"dergo, at the Reſurrection, do prove it "to be only ſtill the *Same*. For this is "ſure, that whatever *Body* does ſuffer a "*Change*, muſt be, and is ſtill ſuppoſed to "be, the *Same*". And I inſiſt ſtill, that This is true, that is, that the Alteration of the Qualities, Modes, and Affections of any *Body*, and therefore of the Human *Body*, prove it to be the *Same Body*. Since if it is

not the *Same*, it muſt be a *New Body*. And a *New Body* is not a *Body changed*, but a *Body* entirely Different, and Another. And when You can prove This not to be true, You will certainly ſay ſomething ſurprizing too.

SECT. IV.

The Third Text conſidered, and Defended, 1 Cor. 15. 53.

BUT You paſs to examine another Text, which, the Sermon ſays, is "more Undeniably direct for the Reſurrec-"tion of the *Same Body*, than Either of the Two before mentioned". It is, 1 *Cor.* 15. 53. *For, This Corruptible muſt put on Incorruption, and This Mortal muſt put on Immortality.* And, here, You tell Me, that the Sermon refers to Mr. *Lock*'s Comment on this Chapter, and to his Third Letter to the Biſhop, but takes no Notice of the Reaſons for the Senſe, in which He underſtands that Diſcourſe of St. *Paul*'s, in both thoſe Places. But I muſt tell You, Sir, directly, that this is not true. What Mr. *Lock* ſays both in His Comment, and His Third Letter, As far as was pertinent, and neceſſary, is taken Notice of, and anſwered, in the Sermon.

Firſt,

First, As to His Comment, There is Nothing material in That, which concerns This Text, except one Note, in which Mr. *Lock* obſerves, that τὸ φθαρτὸν and τὸ θνητὸν have not σῶμα for their Subſtantive, but are Neuters abſolute, to repreſent νεκρόν. And to This the Sermon particularly ſays, that σῶμα ought to be, here, Underſtood; that the Ancient Writers did ſo underſtand it; That this Criticiſm from Grammar is ſtrained; and carries away the Words from Their Natural Conſtruction; That the Scope and Tendency of the Writer is rather to be attended to, than the Exactneſs of the Words. This was ſufficient in a Sermon for a Reply to the Comment. And

Secondly, For what Mr. *Lock* ſays, in His Letter to the Biſhop, All that follows, under This Head, is ſpoken with Reference to it. And You yourſelf take Notice of ſeveral Paſſages, in the Sermon, which are directly concerned with it. So that You could not take Notice of Them, without knowing that I took Notice of Mr. *Lock*. How You came to charge Me, ſo very unjuſtly, therefore, I leave to Yourſelf to conſider.

I will, now, return to defend, What has been ſaid againſt the Comment. It is obſervable, that, when Mr. *Lock* tells us, that

that τὸ φθαρτὸν, and τὸ θνητὸν, are Neuters abſolute, that He leaves out the Word, τοῦτο, which the Apoſtle joins with Them; and it was neceſſary that He ſhould do ſo, to induce His Reader to believe, that the Words, τὸ φθαρτὸν, and τὸ θνητὸν, could poſſibly repreſent νεκροὶ. For, when the Word τοῦτο is added to Them, They are manifeſtly uncapable of ſo indeterminate a Senſe. If the Words, *Mortal*, and *Corruptible*, by Themſelves, could be put upon an Unwary Reader, for the Words, *the Dead*; Yet, it will be very hard to ſuppoſe, that any one ſhould be found ſo eaſy, as to admit, that the Words, *This Mortal*, *This Corruptible*, confined by the Pronoun to the Singular Number, and to ſome particular *Body*, moſt probably, St. *Paul*'s own, ſhould have ſo General, and Uncertain a Meaning, as νεκροὶ *the Dead*, an indeterminate Plural.

Mr. *Lock* was aware, that this Criticiſm of His might ſeem ſtrained; And therefore refers us for a Proof of His Aſſertion, *Firſt*, to Verſe the 42 of this Chapter. Οὕτω καὶ ἡ ἀνάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν σπείρεται ἐν φθορᾷ, Which He interprets *Mortal*, or *Corruptible*, Men, are *Sown*, which is manifeſtly to excuſe a Leſs Strain with a Greater. For I appeal to any Man, whether it be not more natural to ſuppoſe, that σῶμα underſtood is not rather the Nominative Caſe to σπείρεται,

than νεκρὸι; Eſpecially, ſince, σῶμα is joyned with σπείρεται, in this very Sentence, at the 44 Verſe. Neither, was Mr. *Lock* without Apprehenſions, that This might be ſaid, as will appear by and by. And yet, He aggravates this Strain yet further, when He ſays, that the Apoſtle uſes Two Adjectives more, in the Neuter Gender, at Verſe 46, for the Perſons of *Adam* and *Chriſt*, The Words are, ΑΛΛ' ΟΥ ΠΡΩΤΟΝ ΤΟ ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙΚΟΝ. ἀλλὰ τὸ ψυχικὸν, ἔπειτα τὸ πνευματικόν. Whereas it is manifeſt, that theſe Words refer to σῶμα ψυχικὸν, and σῶμα πνευματικόν in the 44 Verſe, *There is a natural Body, and There is a Spiritual Body, And ſo it is written, the firſt Man, Adam, was made a living Soul; the laſt Adam was made, a Quickening Spirit. Howbeit, that was not firſt, which was Spiritual, but that, which was natural, and afterward, that, which is Spiritual;* Where, it is viſible, by the neceſſary Connection of the laſt Words, in Verſe 46, with Thoſe in Verſe 44, that the *Same* σῶμα, or *Body*, muſt be underſtood; and Then, He ſays *Secondly*, that, in the ſame Manner, the Perſon of our Saviour is expreſſed by Adjectives in the Neuter Gender, *Matth.* 1. 20. *Luke* 1. 35. Whereas either παιδίον or βρέφος may be underſtood in Thoſe Places, or the Conſtruction of Them is not neceſſary to be applied Here, as will further appear by and by. So that the Authorities, which

which He cites, being directly againſt Him, the Interpretation, which He founds upon Them, is without Support, and ſinks of Courſe.

But I have one Thing more to offer againſt the Underſtanding τὸ θνητὸν to repreſent νεκροὶ; which You muſt allow to be a good Reaſon; becauſe it is Your Friend Mr. *Lock*'s. And That is This, that in His Note upon *Rom.* 8. 11. which You ſo much admire, He is very poſitive, that θνητὸν, *Mortal*, is no where, in the New Teſtament, attributed to any Thing void of Life, and therefore, how can it poſſibly, here, repreſent νεκροὶ, *the Dead?* When You are at Leiſure, You will do well to reconcile Your Friend to Himſelf. But, from Hence We may obſerve, that Men, who reſolve, right or wrong, to interpret Scripture to Their own Senſe, and to ſerve a Turn, do ſometimes betray Their own ill Deſigns, by being falſe to Themſelves, and by contradicting Their own Aſſertions, in one Place, by contrary Aſſertions, in another.

But I return to ſhew, as I promiſed, that Mr. *Lock* Himſelf was under Apprehenſions, that σῶμα underſtood might be the Nominative Caſe to σπείρεται; and That is manifeſt from His Note upon Verſe the 43 of this Chapter. For, There He ſays, "the

" Time, that Man is in this World, affixed " to this Earth, is his being *Sown*, and not " when being Dead, He is put into the " Grave". And, if this be true, that Men are ſaid, here, to be *Sown*, when They begin to Live, and as long as They live in this World; then, it could not be proper to ſuppoſe, That the *Body* only, or σῶμα, ſhould be ſaid to be *Sown*, here. And ſo, Mr. *Lock* hath, very dexterouſly, ſtruck out This Interpretation, to take away, all at once, the Force of many troubleſome Words, which are uſually underſtood of the Dead *Bodies* of Men, when laid in Their Graves, which ought to be applied, as He thinks, only to the State, and Condition, of Men, in this Mortal Life.

But the Queſtion will be, what Proof He brings to ſupport an Interpretation, ſo very uncommon? Why, That, He tells Us, is from St. *Paul*'s own Words. Yet He gives Us no particular Words from St. *Paul*, but only ſays in His Own; " For Dead " Things are not Sown. Seeds are Sown " being alive, and dye not, till after They " are Sown". I grant indeed, that the Senſe of theſe Words may be deduced from thoſe at Verſe 36. *That, which Thou ſoweſt, is not quickened, except it dye.* But Mr. *Lock* would not allow other People to ſay, that a Conſequence from St. *Paul*'s Words was

was St. *Paul*'s Words, and He ought not to have better Uſage, in This Place, than He gives. But, let Us ſuppoſe, that dead Things are not ſown. What then? Will it follow, that, the Apoſtle cannot, in a Metaphorical, and Figured Senſe, apply the Word *Sown* to a dead *Body*, which in a Proper, and Natural Senſe, is uſually applied to a Living Seed? Or is the *ſowing* of a *dead Body*, a Bolder, or more Violent Metaphor, than the *ſowing* a *living Man*? I deſire to ſee one Inſtance more, in the New Teſtament, where *Living Men* are ſaid to be *Sown*. Our Bleſſed Lord manifeſtly ſpeaks of His Death, and of His *Body*'s being *Sown* in the Grave, in that Compariſon, Joh. 12. 24. *Except a Corn of Wheat fall into the Ground, and dye, it abideth alone, but if it dye, it bringeth forth much Fruit.* But the *Sowing* of Men into the World is, ſure, no Language of Scripture. For in the Prophet *Jeremiah* 31. 27. where there is a Promiſe made, of *Sowing the Houſe of* Iſrael, *and the Houſe of* Judah, *with the Seed of Man*, the Expreſſion, clearly, implies no more, than the increaſing, again, the Numbers of the Jewiſh People; and contains, in it, no Implication, that, All Men are *Sown* into Life, by Their Condition of being in This World. † Mr. *Lock*

 invented

† And in the ſame manner, the Expreſſion in *Iſaiah*, 40. 24. *Yea They ſhall not be Sown*, manifeſtly implies, a depriving Them

invented that Expreſſion, to eaſe himſelf of the Incumbrance of ſuppoſing, that, it is the Dead *Body*, which is *ſown in Diſhonour, that is to be raiſed in Glory*. And yet This Invention of His will not give Him That Eaſe, which He expected from it. For if, Men are ſaid to be *ſown* in the Time of Their Life, in This World, Can the Apoſtle's Words be true, when applied to that Time of being *ſown? It is ſown in Corruption* — *It is ſown in Diſhonour*. For the Life of Man, in this World, is neither a State of *Corruption*, nor *Diſhonour*; tho' it tends to Both, in the Death of the *Body*: The Part of Man to be reduced to *Corruption* and *Diſhonour*. The Nature, therefore, of the *Sowing*, which the Apoſtle ſpeaks of, will not admit, Mr. *Lock*'s Time for it, to be true. And the Connection, which the Words, *It is ſown in Corruption, It is raiſed in Incorruption, It is ſown in Diſhonour, It is raiſed in Glory*, have, with Thoſe, immediately foregoing, *So alſo is the Reſurrection of the Dead*, makes it manifeſt, That the *ſowing*, in *Corruption*, and *Diſhonour*, relates to the Dead, as Riſing in *Incorruption and Glory* relates to the Reſurrection.

Them of temporal Happineſs, and Proſperity, the ſending Extirpation, Ruin, upon Them; without the leaſt regard to the General State of Men in This World.

And beſides, tho' the Burial of the Dead *Body* of a Man doth not exactly anſwer to the *ſowing* of quick Seed in the Earth; yet it anſwers it in the Death, in the Ground, and in the Glorious, and Beautiful Riſing out of it; which are all the Circumſtances, which the Apoſtle intends to illuſtrate, by this Compariſon. When Mr. *Lock* ſays, Dead Things are not *ſown*, He argues upon This falſe Suppoſition, That Alluſions do, and muſt, in all Points, correſpond with the Things, illuſtrated, and explained by Them. I call it a falſe Suppoſition; Becauſe, nothing is more notorious, than that Writers chuſe Images, or Figurative Expreſſions, only, from a general Reſemblance. Thus St. *Paul* might very well borrow a Similitude from *ſowing* of Grain, when He meant to expreſs the Inhumation of a dead *Body*; becauſe They agree in certain Reſpects, Both being laid in the Ground, and Both being raiſed into general Life, equally from a State of Corruption. And the Diſſimilitude between Them in this ſingle Reſpect, that One is laid in the Ground Dead, and the Other, Alive, does not in the leaſt injure the Beauty, or the Propriety, of the Metaphor. When Mr. *Lock*, therefore, argues againſt St. *Paul*'s Intention, to expreſs the Burial of the Dead, by *ſowing*,

becauſe Dead Things are not *ſown;* He might, with equal Strength of Reaſon, and good Senſe, deſtroy every Figure uſed by the ſacred Writers; Particularly, when for Dying, They uſe the Metaphor of *Sleeping,* if the Denyal of ſuch a Metaphorical Intendment would ſerve any Purpoſe of Mr. *Lock*'s, He might tell us, that St. *Paul* in the ſixth Verſe, of this Chapter, could not deſign to ſignify that Thoſe *SOME* were Dead, of whom He ſays, that They were *fallen aſleep,* becauſe He oppoſes it to Men, who are yet alive. For common Senſe will tell Us, that Men may be *fallen aſleep,* who are Yet alive, nay, that none, but Living Men, can truly be ſaid to fall aſleep. But, if This Way of arguing would be accounted intolerable trifling, Mr. *Lock*'s Objection againſt the Metaphorical Uſe of *ſowing,* for laying a *Dead Body* in the Ground, That Dead Things, in Strictneſs of ſpeaking, are not *ſown,* Proceeding on the ſame falſe, and ridiculous Principle, deſerves no better a Name, than mean and poor Fallacy.

Besides, to call the Time, that a Man is in This World, affixed to this Earth, His being *ſown,* is an Abuſe of Words, hard, and unaccountable. Between the lying of a Seed, in, and under Ground, and Men ſubſiſting, living, and acting, above it, there is

is a general Contrariety, inſtead of a general Reſemblance.

FURTHER, how can Men, by being placed, or born, in this World, be ſaid σπείρεσθαι ἐν φθορᾷ? Can You, or any of Mr. *Lock*'s Friends, produce any one Inſtance, where the Natural State of living Man is termed φθορά? Are φθορὰ and ζωὴ either in the New Teſtament, or the *Septuagint* Verſion, ever uſed, as Synonymous? But We, on the other Hand, have pregnant Examples, where φθορὰ, and its Compounds, ſignify Death, or Deſtruction, from that actual Corruption, which neceſſarily attends the *Bodies* of Dead Men. Thus *David*, Pſ. 103. 4. calls upon His Soul, to bleſs the Lord, τὸν λυτρούμενον ἐκ φθορᾶς τὴν ζωήν σου, *who ſaveth thy Life from Deſtruction*, Corruption, or Death. So alſo the Prophet *Jonah* 2. 7. in his Prayer in the Whale's Belly, deſiring to be delivered from that State, which He compares to Death, He ſays, Ἀναβήτω ἐκ φθορᾶς ἡ ζωή μου, *Let my Life aſcend from Corruption*. The *Hebrew* Word, which, in both theſe Places, the *Seventy* render φθορὰ, is always rendered by Them, with Words, importing Death, or the natural Corruption, which is ſubſequent thereupon, or the Grave, or ſome Place, which is ſubterraneous. As Ἀπώλεια, βόθρος, βόθυνος, διαφθορὰ, θάνατος, καταφθορὰ, ῥύπος. So that,

that, upon the Whole, the Phraſeology, as well as the Context, is entirely againſt Mr. *Lock*'s Interpretation in this Place.

And after all, if Mr. *Lock*'s Imagination Here, that Men are *ſown* into This Life, were granted; Yet He cannot, as He hoped, get clear of the Reſurrection of the *Body* by it. Since, it is ſtill, of the Life in This *Body*, which the Apoſtle ſpeaks, that *it is ſown in Corruption, and Diſhonour*, and it is the *ſame Body*, which is *ſown in Corruption, and Diſhonour*, which, He ſays, is alſo *raiſed in Incorruption, and Glory*.

I Have been ſo large upon This Note of Mr. *Lock*'s; becauſe He builds much upon it, and becauſe I would leave no Evaſion of His unanſwered, which relates to the Reſurrection of the *Same Body*.

Mr. *Lock* has Yet one Note farther, upon *Verſe* 35 of this Chapter, which, tho' it relates not particularly to the Words, which We have juſt now conſidered; Yet becauſe it does Violence to the Text; and becauſe his peculiar Doctrine of the Reſurrection is chiefly founded upon it; and You yourſelf are pleaſed to make ſome Exception, againſt my Interpretation of it; I ſhall, here, conſider it. The Words are, *But ſome Man will ſay, How are the Dead*

Dead raiſed up? And with what Body do They come? Upon which, Mr. *Lock* obſerves, "That theſe Words contain Two "Queſtions. *Firſt*, How comes it to paſs, "that Dead Men are raiſed to Life again? "Would it not be better They ſhould live "on? Why do They dye, to live again? "*Secondly*, With what *Body* ſhall They "return to Life? To both theſe He di-"ſtinctly anſwers. 1*ſt*. That Thoſe, who "are raiſed to an heavenly State, ſhall "have *Other Bodies*. 2*ly*. That it is fit, "that Men ſhould dye, Death being no "improper Way to the attaining *Other* "*Bodies*". Now, I cannot but obſerve, Here, that this Note opens all the Myſtery, at once, of Mr. *Lock*'s Doctrine of the Reſurrection. You had told me before, and I ſee it in His own Words, (*a*) That Mr. *Lock* does, by no Means, deny, that the *Same Bodies* ſhall be raiſed at the laſt Day. Yet, it is certain, He diſputes againſt it, with all his Might; It is certain, He ſays, the Reſurrection of the *Body* is not to be proved by Reaſon; It is certain, He ſays, the Reſurrection of the *Body* is not to be found in Scripture. And Yet, He pretends, he does not deny it. What ridiculous Shuffling is This? For it clear-

(p) 3 Lett. *p*. 195.

ly

ly appears, that He does not believe it; And from His Note upon This Place, it is manifeſt He declares the contrary; and That, at the Reſurrection, Men ſhall have *Other Bodies*, and not the *Same*. But to the Note itſelf, I ask, How comes it to paſs, that theſe Words, *How are the Dead raiſed?* πῶς ἐγείρονται οἱ νεκροὶ; ſhould be interpreted, "Why are dead Men raiſed "to Life again? Would it not be better "They ſhould live on? Why do They "dye, to live again?" Is not the common Tranſlation of Them moſt juſt, and natural, according to the Original? And how can They be thought truly, and properly, to import more than This, How can it be poſſible, for any Power to raiſe the Dead? How can They be Raiſed, when Their *Bodies* are diſſolved into Duſt? This Queſtion clearly relates to the Power, that ſhall raiſe the Dead, which the Heathens uſed to deny, even, to God Himſelf. (*b*) But Mr. *Lock* thought it moſt proper for Him, to alter, here, the State of the Queſtion, becauſe He intended to alter the State of the Doctrine, concerning the Reſurrection. It ſeemed to Him the moſt probable Foundation, to erect His Scheme upon, to ſuppoſe, that the Words

(*b*) Plin. Nat. Hiſt. L. 2. c. 7.

im-

implied, that Men therefore died out of this *Body*, that They might have *New Bodies* given Them, at the Reſurrection. Whereas, if They are ſuppoſed to relate to the Power of God; All Things, which imply not a Contradiction, are equally eaſy to That. And therefore, the *Old Body* might be as eaſily reſtored, as a *New* one given, at the Laſt Day.

THE other Queſtion, *With What Bodies do They come?* Mr. *Lock*, indeed, allows to ſtand, as it does in the Text. But, I am ſure, He gives an Anſwer to it, which the Apoſtle no where authorized him to make, That the Dead ſhall have *Other Bodies*. Nor does He dare to refer to the Words, in which, the Apoſtle teaches ſuch Doctrine. For the Compariſons, which follow after the Words, in this Place of the Apoſtle, and which, Mr. *Lock* ſeems to think, make for his Doctrine, the Compariſons from the *ſowing* of Seed, from the Diverſities of Bodies, and the different Beauties, and Glories of Them, cannot be ſuppoſed to imply, that the Dead ſhall have *Other Bodies*; but that *Their Old Bodies*, at the Reſurrection, ſhall be given to Them again, more glorious, and beautiful, and durable, than They were before. The Alluſion muſt not be ſuppoſed to hold in all Points, but only in this particular

ticular Reſpect, which it is his Deſign to illuſtrate. This is manifeſt from the Concluſion He makes, after He has finiſhed his Compariſons. *So alſo is the Reſurrection of the Dead. It is ſown in Corruption, It is raiſed in Incorruption*, &c. directing Us to Underſtand, that this *ſame Body* of Our's, which is *ſown in Corruption*, ſhall be raiſed Spiritual and Incorruptible.

And This Senſe, Mr. *Lock* himſelf, did, once, allow to this Place, For in his *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, He thus expreſſes Himſelf. "Theſe Frail, Mortal *Bodies*, "ſhall be *changed* into Spiritual, Immortal "Bodies, at the Reſurrection; When *this* "*Mortal ſhall have put on Immortality*, "1 Cor. 15. 54. Which in That Chapter, "*v.* 42 —— 44. The Apoſtle farther ex-"preſſes thus. *So alſo is the Reſurrection* "*of the dead. It is ſown in Diſhonour*, "*it is raiſed in Glory: It is ſown in* "*Weakneſs, it is raiſed in Power: It is* "*ſown a Natural Body, it is raiſed a Spi-*"*ritual Body*, &c." (*c*) So that You ſee, Your dear Friend was once under the ſame Conviction, with Others, concerning the Nature of the Reſurrection, and the Senſe of this Chapter. And therefore, I muſt

(*c*) Reaſ. Chriſt. *p.* 206.

tell

tell You alſo, here, that it is obſervable of Mr. *Lock*, even in His Third Letter, (*d*) That when the Words of the Text juſt before mentioned, 1 *Cor.* 15. 53, 54. were urged, by the Biſhop, to prove the Reſurrection of the *Same Body*, He returns no Anſwer to Them; and did very wiſely in returning none; becauſe, He knew, He had once allowed Himſelf, the Biſhop's Senſe of the Words; And becauſe He ſaw, They were as clear, as the Light, againſt Him. And thus far, of Your Friend's Notes upon This Chapter, 1 *Cor.* 15.

SECT. V.

Paſſages of Mr. Lock, *concerning His State of the Reſurrection, in His Third Letter to the Biſhop of* Worceſter, *Conſidered, and Anſwered.*

I Paſs now, to conſider with You, That, which is urged by the Sermon, againſt what Mr. *Lock* ſays, in His Third Letter to the Biſhop, for His State of the Reſurrection. And Here, tho' there are very good Reaſons urged in the Sermon, why, Thoſe Words, *This Corruptible muſt put on Incorruption, and this Mortal muſt put on Im-*

(*d*) 3 Lett. *p.* 197.

mortality,

mortality, ſhould be ſuppoſed to expreſs This Senſe to us, That the *Same Body*, *Mortal*, *and Corruptible*, ſhould be raiſed to *Immortality*, and *Incorruption*; Yet ſuppoſing, but not admitting, Mr. *Lock*'s Senſe of thoſe Words to be true, that τὸ φθαρτὸν does repreſent νεκροὶ, *This Corruptible*, *The Dead* in general. The Sermon urges further, " That it may be as well concluded, " that the Dead were to be raiſed without " any *Bodies* at all, as that the *Bodies*, in " which They died, ſhall not be raiſed. For " why is a Man, or Human Perſon, ſaid to " be Dead? Not with Regard to His Soul. " That Part of Him muſt be allowed to " live after the Death of the *Body*. And if " the *Body* alone dye, it muſt be the raiſing " of that *Body*, alone, to Life again, by " which, the Dead, or Dead Perſon, or Man, " can in any proper Senſe, or Conſtruction " of Words, be ſaid to be *Quickened*, *Revi-* " *ved*, or *Raiſed*: Since the joyning of a " living Soul to a *New Body* can never be " called an ἀνάστασις, a Reſurrection". And to This You anſwer, " That is not by the " *Body* alone, but by a Separation of the " Soul from the *Body*, that a Man dies; and " by the Reunion of that Soul with a *Body*, " The Man may, in a very proper Senſe, " be ſaid to be raiſed from the Dead, whe- " ther the *Body*, to which it is united, be " *New* or *Old*". And a very pertinent, and

and learned Anſwer, no doubt, This is. For You grant, it ſeems, that a Man conſiſts of *Body*, and Soul, and that He dies by a Separation of the Soul from the *Body*. Well, What is This to the Purpoſe? The Queſtion asked remains ſtill to be anſwered; When the Soul, and *Body* of a Man are thus ſeparated, Do They Both loſe their Exiſtence, Action, and Perception? This You dare not ſay. Or is it the *Body* only, which is loſt to All Senſe of Life? This You muſt ſay. And if it muſt be ſaid, that the *Body*, only, is loſt in Death, it muſt be ſaid, that by the reviving and raiſing of that *Body* again, only, the Man can be ſaid to be raiſed from the Dead. The ſtrict Scripture Notion of Dying, it is ſure, will help Us beſt to the ſtrict Scripture Notion of Riſing again. But in the ſtrict Scripture Notion of Dying, the Soul has no Concern. For if according to the ſtrict Scripture Notion of Dying, the Soul could, in general, be ſaid to dye, it might, in particular, be ſaid to dye a Natural Death, or it might be ſaid to be killed. But our Lord, *Matth.* 10. 28. denies that *any Man can kill the Soul.* When therefore at any Time in Scripture, a Man, who conſiſts of Soul and *Body*, is ſaid to dye, or to be killed, we know, that in the ſtrictneſs of Scripture Language, We ought to underſtand that Saying, only of His *Body*. But if according to ſtrictneſs of ſpeaking, Death

in Scripture hath only the *Body* for its Object, We are ſure, that however looſely Men, or the Dead, are generally ſaid to riſe, it can only by the Rule of Oppoſites be meant, that the *Body* riſes, or is raiſed. And in Conſequence, every Time that Mention is made of raiſing the Dead in Scripture, the Holy Ghoſt does, in Effect, really, deliver the Doctrine of the Reſurrection of the *Body*.

Besides, The Soul having always lived cannot be ſaid to be raiſed from the Dead. But the *Body*, having been under a State of Death, when it is reunited to the Life of the Soul, is properly the Subject of a true Reſurrection. Tho' Death divides aſunder a Man's Soul and *Body*; yet, Theſe Two Parts of Him are not equally Loſers by that Separation. The *Body* is loſt, the Soul exiſts. When therefore, That, which is loſt, is reſtored to That, which exiſts; the Man in a proper Senſe revives, and by the Reſtitution of Life to His *Body*, is truly raiſed from the Dead. But it is impoſſible that an Union of the Soul with a *New Body* ſhould, with any good Senſe, be called a Reviviſcence of the Man, or a Reſurrection from the Dead. Becauſe, what was never loſt, in a State of Death, can never, with good Senſe be ſaid to be reſtored, or raiſed from thence You know that the Word, ἀνάστασις, or Reſurrection

ſurrection, ſignifies the raiſing of a *Body*, which once ſtood, but is fallen down; and therefore, it is impoſſible, That a *New Body*, which never ſtood before, or never fell, ſhould, with good Senſe, be ſaid to be raiſed again; Or, in Your own Words, thus, If Death is a Separation of a Man's Soul, and *Body*, the Reſurrection from the Dead muſt be the Reunion of That Man's Soul and *Body*; and That Man's Soul and *Body* are not reunited, except the *Same Body* be joyned to the Same Soul. He cannot be the *Same* Man otherwiſe. For the *Same Body* is as neceſſary to make the *Same* Man, as the Same Soul. The *Same* Man, therefore, does not riſe from the Dead, except He riſes with the *Same Body*. If He is united to live for ever in a *New Body* at the Laſt Day, He is not raiſed to Immortality. Nor does the Corruptible Part of Him put on Incorruption.

Now againſt all This, What are You able to produce? Not the leaſt Shew of Reaſon, Either for Yourſelf, or for Your Friend. You, only, confidently, affirm, as He does, that a Man may, in a very proper Senſe, be ſaid to be raiſed from the Dead, whether the *Body*, to which the Soul is united, be *New* or *Old*. Which bare Affirmation it would have been ſufficient Anſwer to, as barely to deny. But I have ſhew'd You,

that I do not deny it, without ſufficient Reaſon. And therefore when You cite Your Maſter's *Ipſe dixit*, at Length, where He ſays, "As to the Propriety of the "Name, I think, it will not be much queſti-"oned, that if the *Same Man* riſe, who "was dead, it may be very properly called, "the Reſurrection of the Dead;" (*e*) I cannot but ſay, in Return, that without doubt, Mr. *Lock* knew beſt, what He himſelf thought. But that if theſe Words, *The Same Man*, mean any Thing elſe, but the Reunion of the *Same Body* and the *Same* Soul, They put an Affront upon common Senſe, and bid Defiance to the common Ways of Speaking among Men.

SECT. VI.

Whether, any real Difference, in the Scripture, betwen the Dead, and the Bodies *of the Dead, as Mr.* Lock *affirms.*

BUT You proceed, and tell me, that I ſay, There is no Diſtinction in the Scriptures, upon This Occaſion, between the Dead, and the Bodies of the Dead. You ſhould have added, becauſe the Sermon adds it, but only that of Words; that

(*e*) 3 Lett. *p.* 209.

is,

is, No real Diſtinction. For having proved before, that the Reſurrection is always to be underſtood of the *Body* alone; and that there is Nothing dies, or is dead, of a Man but His Body; it neceſſarily follows, that even when the Scriptures ſpeak of the Reſurrection, in the Expreſſion of the Reſurrection of the Dead, That Expreſſion can be underſtood only of the *Body*. And in Conſequence, the Reſurrection of the *Body*, and the Reſurrection of the Dead, are not really diſtinct, but in different Words mean the ſame Thing.

Now the Occaſion of making This Obſervation, in the Sermon, is this. Mr. *Lock* (*f*) had affirmed, that St. *Paul* 1 Cor. 15. and in other Places, where He diſcourſes of the Reſurrection, diſtinguiſhes between the Dead that ſhall be raiſed, and the *Bodies* of the Dead; that, "it is, νεκροὶ, πάντες, οἱ, "which are Nominative Caſes, every "where, to ἐγείρονται, ζωοποιηθήσονται, ἐγερθή-"σονται, and not σώματα, *Bodies*; And that "the ſame Manner of ſpeaking is obſerved "all thro' the New Teſtament, whenever "it is ſaid, *raiſe*, *quicken*, *Reſurrection* "*of the Dead*, the *Body* not being men-"tioned". How falſe This is, has been

(*f*) 3 Lett. *p.* 199.

already ſeen, in the Texts, we have examined; where the *Body* is, either nam'd expreſly, or is, neceſſarily implied to be the Subject of the Reſurrection. But, in Anſwer to all the Places of Scripture, where the Dead only, in general, are mentioned, it was ſufficient to ſay in the Sermon, that, the Diſtinction between the Dead, and the *Bodies* of the Dead, was not a real, but only a verbal Diſtinction; For this manifeſt Reaſon, becauſe, the Idea, which is to anſwer the Word νεκροὶ, the Dead, is the ſame, every where, in the New Teſtament, where the General Reſurrection at the Laſt Day is ſpoken of, as that of Dead *Bodies*, or *Bodies* of the Dead. Since a Man dies, only, in the Death of His *Body*, as was obſerved before; and therefore can be ſaid to be raiſed, only, by having that dead Part of Him reſtored to Life.

And I muſt have Leave to add This, alſo, further, That νεκροὶ, is, in the *Septuagint* Tranſlation of the Old Teſtament, the Language of which the Books of the New Teſtament chooſe to follow, ſeveral Times, put, for Dead *Bodies* or Carkaſſes. Particularly, *Iſa.* 34. 3. οἱ δὲ τραυματίαι αὐτῶν ἐιφήσονται, καὶ οἱ νεκροὶ. Jeremiah 7. 33. Καὶ ἔσονται οἱ νεκροὶ τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου εἰς βρῶσιν. — 19. 7. δώσω τὰς νεκρὰς αὐτῶν εἰς βρῶσιν. Ezek. 11. 6. Επληθύνατε νεκροὺς ὑμῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ

I muſt alſo add the famous Paſſage of *Ezekiel* 37. 9. where the Spirit is commanded to *breath into the Dead Bodies* which are to be raiſed. For on this Occaſion, the LXX do not ſay ἐμφύσησον εἰς τὰ σώματα ταῦτα, they think themſelves ſufficiently clear, when They render it, ἐμφύσησον εἰς τοὺς νεκροὺς τούτους. See alſo 1 *Reg.* 31. 8. *Pſ.* 143. 3. *Deut.* 28. 26. In this laſt Inſtance, the Original Word is the ſame, with what, at other Times, they frequently render σῶμα, meaning, a *dead Carkaſs*, viz. *Deut.* 21. 33. *Joſh.* 8. 29. And in Eight other Places. So little Difference did They make between οἱ νεκροὶ, and σώματα, or νεκρὰ σώματα. So that if I ſhould ſay directly contrary to Mr. *Lock*, that νεκροὶ in every Place, where the general Reſurrection is mentioned, repreſents σώματα, I ſhould ſpeak perfectly agreable to the Senſe of the Scriptures, and to the proper Uſe and Signification of the Word in Them.

And have You any Thing to offer againſt the Truth of what is here urged? No. But You ſay, that the Queſtions put, 1 *Cor.* 15. 35. *How are the Dead raiſed? And with what Body do They come?* (becauſe this is the Text Mr. *Lock*, particularly, mentions) do ſtand to ſupport the Diſtinction between the Dead, and the *Bodies* of the Dead. But You were told before,

fore, and I tell it You again, that the Diſtinction, even Here, between the Dead, and the *Bodies* of the Dead, is, only, verbal; and That, if They are rightly attended to, or underſtood, They will not bear that diſagreable Senſe, which Mr. *Lock* invented for Them, to ſerve his own Occaſions upon Them. "How are the Dead "*Bodies* raiſed? And with what *Bodies* "do the Dead *Bodies* come"? But This very natural and proper Senſe, How are the *Bodies* of the Dead raiſed? And with what Kind of *Bodies*, or with a *Body* how qualified, do the Dead come? And the Paraphraſe of Them, in the Sermon, is very juſt, in theſe Words. "The Dead *Bodies* "of Men, when They are raiſed to Life "again, What Qualities ſhall They be en-"du'd with"? Here, You ſee, that tho' there is a Verbal Diſtinction between the Dead, and the *Bodies* of the Dead, Yet that, in Reality, That Diſtinction is loſt. And that by the Dead, we are to underſtand no more, than dead *Bodies*.

It is, indeed, impoſſible to avoid ſpeaking *perſonally* of a dead *Body*, in any Language. Be pleaſed to conſider the following Inſtances. The Evangeliſt St. *John*, ſpeaking of the dead *Body* of *Lazarus*, expreſſes himſelf *perſonally*, John 11. 39. where *Martha* ſays, κύριε, ἤδη ὄζει· τεταρταῖος γὰρ

γὰρ ἐστι. The Prædicate ὄζει can have nothing for its true Subject, but the *Body* of *Lazarus*, which yet in the very next Word is deſcribed *perſonally*, under the Word τεταρταῖος, for otherwiſe it would have been τεταρταῖον. Indeed, the Dead *Body* of *Lazarus* had, more than once, been *perſonally* denoted in the ſame Chapter; as at Verſe the 17th, where it is ſaid, that when *Jeſus* came, He found, that, *He* had *already been in the Grave four Days*; which, it would be highly abſurd to underſtand of His Perſon, in whatever Acceptation That Word be taken, and muſt be meant of His dead *Body* only. Again, at Verſe 34, Our Lord asks, *Where have Ye laid Him?* That is, *Lazarus*; meaning nevertheleſs, to enquire, only, for His Grave, where They had laid his dead *Body*. Again, at Verſe 41, *They took away the Stone, where the* dead Man *was laid*. So alſo in another Inſtance mention'd by St. *Mark*, where our Lord raiſed *Jairus*'s Daughter; inſtead of ſaying, that *Jeſus* came where the *Corpſe* of the Damſel was laid; He ſays, that, *He came where the* Damſel *was laid*. So alſo, St. *Luke*, Acts 9. 37. ſays of *Tabitha*, i. e. of Her *Body*, now dead, that after *They had waſhed* Her, *They laid* Her *in an upper Chamber*; tho' at Verſe 40, He ſays, that St. *Peter, turning to the* Body, *ſaid*, Tabitha *ariſe*. So

that, it was plainly indifferent to the Sacred Writers, whether They ſpeak of dead *Bodies, ſtrictly,* or *perſonally.* Tho' They, generally, uſe the latter Way. More Examples of this Kind may be found in the Scriptures, See *Matth.* 8. 21, 22. —— 28. 4. *Luke* 7. 12. — 9. 59, 60. *Acts* 5. 6, 10. And, particularly, the οἱ ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις, in the *Text* of the Sermon, cannot be, properly, underſtood to be meant of any Thing, but the *Bodies,* which are in the Graves, or were once there, tho' the Expreſſion be *perſonal.* And in Profane Authors, *Homer,* in particular, ſpeaks of the Bodies of His Heroes in his firſt Book of the *Iliad,* in this Manner,

—— Αὐτὰς δ' ἑλώρια τεῦχε κύνεσσιν.

Upon Which Verſe *Didymus,* the Scholiaſt, thus. Αντὶ τοῦ, τὰ δὲ σώματα αὐτῶν, And in the Same Manner, of the *Body* of *Hector,* in the laſt Verſe of that Poem,

Ως οἵγ' ἀμφίεπον τάφον Ἕκτορος ἱπποδάμοιο.

And ſo *Virgil,* — *Pueri, innuptæq; Puellæ, Impoſitiq; rogis Juvenes ante ora Parentum.*

And in our own Language, The *Body* of a Man dead, or buried, is always ſpoken of, under the Name of the Man himſelf; as

as You will allow, if You give me Leave to ask You that Queſtion, Where Mr. *Lock* was buried? So that upon the Whole it appears, That, however perſonally the Dead are ſpoken of, nothing more is intended, than Their *Bodies*, and that the Diſtinction between the Dead, and the *Bodies* of the Dead, is Nothing elſe but That of Words.

It is very eaſy, Now, for You to ſit ſtill, and yawn, and ſay, This is an hard Shift; This is forced; This is ſtrained; and to give no Kind of Reaſon for ſaying ſo. But I appeal to any Unprejudiced Man, whether the Words, ποίῳ σώματι ἔρχονται; be not, truly, and literally, tranſlated, "With "What Kind of *Body*, or What Sort of "*Body*, or with a *Body* How qualified "do They come"? And whether the Words, *What Body*, in the common Tranſlation, do not imply the ſame Senſe? And in Conſequence, Whether this Paraphraſe upon Them, "the Dead *Bodies* of Men, "when raiſed to Life again, What Qua-"lities ſhall They be endued with"? be not juſt, and natural. If You had any Thing, in Point of Reaſon, to offer againſt ſuch an Appeal, it would deſerve to be conſidered.

SECT.

SECT. VII.

A Large Paſſage, out of Mr. Lock's *Third Letter to the Biſhop of* Worceſter, *Conſidered, and Anſwered.*

YOU tell Me, in the next Place, with a Sneer, that, " it is not Your Purpoſe to examine the more *Exact Enquiry* of the Sermon into the Senſe of Scripture upon This Point; Nor to take the Pains You did on the Firſt Text; becauſe, it ſeems, You think the Conteſt of little Importance, and that it matters not, much, Which Way it is determined ". And, This I can't deny, that You are certainly, Sir, at Liberty to diſmiſs Your Diſpute with Me, How, and Where, You pleaſe, and to take as little Pains, upon this Occaſion as You think fit. But, really, for a Pains-Taker, I think You have given Yourſelf as little Trouble, both about the Text You mention, and in all You have, here, writ, as any one could wiſh. For, upon that Text, and every where elſe, What have You done but tranſcribed Mr. *Lock?* Another Man might perhaps think, This, ſome Trouble; but a Friend, as You are, ought not to think it much. And therefore perhaps I may be able to give a more probable Reaſon,

ſon, why You are unwilling to take the ſame Pains, Here, which You did before; And that is This, That Mr. *Lock* furniſhes You with Nothing, directly to the Purpoſe, beſides that long Paſſage, which You cite out of Him to conclude this Head. For, certainly, Mr. *Lock*'s Reputation is a much more trifling Subject to write upon, than the Senſe of an Article of Faith. And what muſt You give Me Leave to think of You, when You write ſo much, as You have here done, and yet think, That what You write about, is a Matter of little Importance.

As to the Obſervations therefore, that are made, in the Sermon, upon the 1 *Cor.* 15. and which have been, in Part, already, above, repeated, and will, in Part, be conſidered, preſently, in the Paſſage cited from Mr. *Lock*, I leave Them to the Judgement of the World. And, for Mr. *Lock*'s Comments upon the ſame Chapter, as far as They concern the Reſurrection of the *Body*, They have been alſo particularly conſidered, and anſwered. What I have now to do, is to follow Your Friend's Obſervations upon the ſame Chapter, as You ſet Them before Me out of His Third Letter. (*g*)

(*g*) 3 Lett. *p.* 200, 201.

Mr.

Mr. *Lock* begins Them in this Manner. "This therefore being ſo, that the Spirit of "God keeps to This Phraſe, in the New "Teſtament, of *Raiſing, Quickening, Re-* "*ſurrection of the Dead*, &c. and that, the "*Body* is not mentioned to this Purpoſe, a "good Chriſtian may believe All, that is "revealed there, concerning the Reſurrec- "tion, without enquiring, whether the "Dead ſhall have the very *Same Bodies*, "or no". But, in Anſwer to This, I return; that Mr. *Lock* takes That for granted, Here, which He has not proved. The Spirit of God does not keep ſo expreſly to this Form of ſpeaking, in the New Teſtament, as He affirms. We have ſeen already, that where the Reſurrection at the Laſt Day is ſpoken of, the Scriptures mention, *Quickening Our Mortal Bodies; Changing our vile Bodies;* and ſay, Twice, expreſly, in the Same Chapter, That, *This Corruptible ſhall put on Incorruption, This Mortal ſhall put on Immortality.* And it has, alſo, been proved, from the Nature of the Thing, and from the neceſſary Conſtruction, and Uſe of the Expreſſion, in the Scriptures, that, where the Phraſe of *Raiſing, Quickening, Reſurrection of the Dead*, &c. is uſed, That it ought to be underſtood, properly, and only, of the Reſurrection of the *Body*. So that, We have clear Grounds to infer, that Mr.

Mr. *Lock*'s Concluſion is falſe. And We may juſtly turn His own Words againſt Him, as the Sermon does, and ſay. "We do not "ſee, but a good Chriſtian, who reads the "Scripture with an Intention to believe all "that is there revealed to Him concerning "the Reſurrection, muſt find himſelf deter-"mined to believe the Reſurrection of the "*Same Body*.

For, tho' Mr. *Lock* adds further, by Way of Supplement to His former Reaſons; "That the Apoſtle, by the Appellation, "that He beſtows here on Him that makes "it, ſeems not much to encourage ſuch an "Enquiry"; Yet it is plain, as the Ser-"mon ſays, that, The harſh Word, Thou Fool, Ἄφρον, thou Man without a Thought, is not Uſed by the Apoſtle to forbid our believing, the Riſing and the Dying *Body* to be the *Same*; but to chide any Man's Stupidity, and Incogitancy, who could ſuppoſe that, the *Bodies* of Men, at the Reſurrection, ſhall not be far more glorious, than it is poſſible for Them to be, in this Life. This is clear from the Connection, which the Parts of the Apoſtle's Diſcourſe have, here, with one another.

The Apoſtle, deſigning to give a particular Account of the glorious State of the *Juſt*, at Their Reſurrection, introduces it by

by Way of Queſtion. *How are the Dead raiſed up? And with what Body do They come?* And then, by Way of Anſwer, directs Chriſtians to conſider, that, as Seed is ſown, to riſe again more beautiful; as God has formed, on Earth, the Bodies of Men, and Beaſts, and Birds, and Fiſhes, with different Degrees of Beauty; and as, in the Heavens, the cœleſtial Bodies, the Sun, and Moon, and Stars, have different Degrees of Brightneſs, and Glory, given to Them; So it ſhall happen at the Reſurrection of the *Juſt*. That *Body*, which, like Seed, is ſown into the Ground, in Corruption, Diſhonour, and Weakneſs, ſhall be raiſed in Incorruption, Glory, and Power.

This, is manifeſtly, the Connection of the Apoſtle's Diſcourſe. And I only deſire, that any Man would give Himſelf Leave, impartially to conſider, and compare This, with what is ſaid by the Apoſtle, from 35 to 44 Verſe of this Chapter. I take Leave to tranſcribe, here, the whole Paſſage. 35. *But ſome Man will ſay, How are the Dead raiſed up? And with what Body do They come? Thou Fool, that which Thou ſoweſt, is not quickened except it dye. And that which Thou ſoweſt, Thou ſoweſt not that Body, which ſhall be, but bare grain, it may chance, of Wheat, or of ſome other Grain. But God giveth it a Body, as it hath*

hath pleaſed Him, and to every Seed His own Body. All Fleſh is not the ſame Fleſh: But there is one Kind of Fleſh of Men, another Fleſh of Beaſts, another of Fiſhes, and another of Birds. There are alſo cœleſtial Bodies, and Bodies terreſtrial: But the Glory of the cœleſtial is one, and the Glory of the terreſtrial is another. There is one Glory of the Sun, and another Glory of the Moon, and another Glory of the Stars; for one Star differeth from another Star in Glory. So alſo is the Reſurrection of the Dead. It is ſown in Corruption, It is raiſed in Incorruption: It is ſown in Diſhonour, It is raiſed in Glory: It is ſown in Weakneſs, It is raiſed in Power.

So that, when Mr. *Lock* tells us, as He goes on in This Place, " that by the Re-" mainder of St. *Paul*'s Anſwer, a Man " will not find the Determination of the " Apoſtle to be much in Favour of the " very *Same Body*, unleſs the being told, " that the *Body* ſown, is not that *Body*, " which ſhall be, be the Way to deliver " This, as an Article of Faith ". The Anſwer to Him is very ready, and natural, from the Sermon, that when the Apoſtle ſays, *Thou ſoweſt not that Body, which ſhall be*, He means, not to inſinuate, that the Riſing *Body* ſhall be a *New Body*, entirely

Diſtinct from that which died; But only, that the *Body* ſown, and dead, hath none of thoſe Beauties, in which it will appear, when it riſes again, at its proper Reſurrection. And He was told as much as This, by the Biſhop, (*b*) tho' He thought fit to make no Reply to it, but paſſed off to other Matter.

And when Mr. *Lock* goes on, further, to tell us, "That the Apoſtle Here ſays, "that the Body raiſed is as different from "That which was laid down, as the Fleſh "of Man is, from the Fleſh of Beaſts, "Fiſhes, and Birds, or, as the Sun, Moon, "and Stars are different from one another, "or, as different as a Corruptible, Weak, "Natural, Mortal Body is from an Incor-"ruptible, Powerful, Spiritual, Immortal "Body, and Laſtly, as different, as a Bo-"dy, That is Fleſh, and Blood, is from a "Body that is not Fleſh and Blood". It is manifeſt, that He miſrepreſents, and perverts, the Senſe of the Apoſtle, whoſe Purpoſe it is, to ſhew, not, that the *Body* Raiſed is a different *Body* from That, which was laid down; But, only, as was ſaid before, that the Riſing *Bodies* of the *Juſ*

(*b*) 3 Lett. *p.* 188, 197.

ſhal

ſhall differ, as much, in Beauty, and Glory, as different Bodies, in the Earth, and in the Heavens, differ from one another, in Beauty, and Glory. For, the Bodies of Seeds, and of Men, and of Beaſts, and of Birds, and of Fiſhes differ not in the Matter or Subſtance, of which They are made; But only in Their Forms, and Qualities, and ſeveral Beauties. And the Heavenly Bodies, the Sun, and Moon, and Stars, are not, vulgarly, ſuppoſed to differ, in Matter, and Subſtance, But only, in the Diſtinctions, of Brightneſs, and Glory. And a *Body*, that is not Fleſh, and Blood, may be formed out of a *Body*, that was Fleſh, and Blood, and differ from it, not, as to the Eſſence of a *Body*, but only, as to Immortality, and Glory. For ſo, Our Saviour's Mortal *Body*, before His Reſurrection, was transfigured, and after it, transformed, into a Glorious, Heavenly, and Immortal, *Body*. And ſo, St. *Paul* aſſures us, in the Place before cited, ſhall *our vile Body be changed, that it may be faſhioned like unto His Glorious Body*. Nay ſo he aſſures Us, in this very Place, as was obſerved above, which We are now conſidering. Since it is undeniable, that the *Body*, which he ſpeaks of Here, as *Earthy*, *Animal*, *Weak*, *Mortal*, and *Corruptible*, is the *very Same*, that he ſpeaks of, as *Heavenly*, *Spiritual*, *Powerful*, *Immortal*, and *Incorruptible*.

And therefore, All This, which is contained in St. *Paul*'s Words, together with what He delivers, concerning the Reſurrection of the Dead at the Laſt Day, in other Places of His Writings, amounts to a Clear, and Full Declaration and Proof, that the Dead ſhall be raiſed with the *Same Bodies*, in which They Lived and Dyed.

And This will be ſufficient Conviction to any good, and ſober Chriſtian, tho' of the meaneſt Capacities, that the *Same Body* ſhall be raiſed at the Reſurrection, tho' He does not find thoſe very *Expreſs Words* in the Scriptures. For tho' Mr. *Lock* demands thoſe *Plain* and *Expreſs Words*, to be found *There;* Yet *Plain* and *Expreſs Senſe* is certainly as good as *Plain* and *Expreſs Words*. And That is, unqueſtionably, as we have proved, to be found there. It is, certainly, ſufficient Proof of any Doctrine, if the *Senſe* of it be contained in the Scriptures; Or, if it be clearly deduced from Them; whether the *Preciſe* Words, in which it is delivered, are expreſſed in them, or not. Can that Man be ſaid to be a good Chriſtian, who will receive nothing for an Article of Faith, but what is, in *expreſs Words*, delivered in Scripture? Are all *acknowledged* Articles of Faith ſo delivered? Or can any Doctrine be ex

expreſſed ſo *Plain*, which ſome Capacity may not be dull enough to doubt; and ſome Minds perverſe enough to conteſt, the Truth of? If the Anſwer to all theſe Queſtions be eaſy, as it is, Mr. *Lock*'s Call for *Expreſs Words* of Scripture is Evaſive, and Abſurd. And I have ſufficiently proved the ſecond Enquiry of the Sermon, againſt all that is ſaid by Him, and You.

SECT. VIII.

Paſſages of Scripture, produced in the Sermon, not conſidered by Mr. Lock's *Friend, and left unanſwered.*

BUT before I leave this Enquiry, I muſt put You in Mind, that You take no Notice of two Paſſages of Scripture, produced, Here, to prove, alſo, the Reſurrection of the *Same Body*. The Firſt, That *Text* upon which the Sermon is formed, *John* 5. 28, 29. *The Hour is coming, in the Which All that are in their Graves, ſhall hear His Voice, And ſhall come forth.* The Other is, That Paſſage in *Rev.* 20, 13. *The Sea ſhall give up the Dead, which are in it, and Death and* Hades *ſhall give up the Dead, which are in Them.* Upon which Places it is urged in the Sermon, "Why This particular Mention of the "Abode of the Dead? Why is the Holy

" Spirit of God, ſo very exact, ſo minute-
" ly circumſtantial, if not to aſſure Us of
" this Truth, againſt all Contradiction,
" That the *Same* Human *Body*, which
" Dyed, and was Buried, or was Lodged
" ſomewhere in the Repoſitories of Na-
" ture, ſhould, at the Laſt Day, be called
" into Life again; And to prevent all Pre-
" tence of making any Diſtinction between
" the Dead, and the Bodies of the Dead,
" which might be more than a Diſtinction
" of Words". All This, it ſeems, did not fall within the Compaſs of Your Obſervation. And the Reaſon of it I ſhall preſume to be, that Mr. *Lock* can ſupply You with no pertinent Anſwer to Them. For tho' the Firſt of theſe Texts is produced againſt Mr. *Lock* by the Biſhop of *Worceſter*; Yet Mr. *Lock*'s Anſwer to it, is ſo manifeſtly Trifling, and Peculiarly adapted to the Biſhop's Manner of Arguing, that it could not be applied to any one elſe. And therefore the Force of it, together with That of the other Paſſage, cited from the Revelations, remains Unanſwered.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

Proofs, for the Reſurrection of the Same Body *from Congruities in the Nature of God, and Man, Conſidered, and Defended.*

I Paſs therefore, Now, to conſider You, upon the Third Enquiry. What Congruities there may be in the Nature of God, and Man, to confirm our Belief, that the Dying and Raiſed Bodies of Men ſhall be the ſame. And, Here, it ſeems we are to fare the better, becauſe Mr. *Lock* is not much concern'd. But, however, ſome Examination We muſt paſs through.

SECT. I.

The Congruity, from the Nature of God, Conſidered, and Defended.

YOU begin upon theſe Words, "It "ſeems highly congruous to the Ju-"ſtice of God, that thoſe *very Bodies*, "which were Partners with, and Inſtru-"ments to the Souls of Men, in the good, "or evil Actions, They did, in This Life,

" ſhould, in the Other, be Partners with, " and Inſtruments to, the Happineſs, or " Miſery, due to their Sins, or Virtues ". You obſerve upon Theſe Words, that " This " Argument ſeems not very well ſuited to " the Notion of the *Sameneſs* of the Re- " ſurrection *Body*, as delivered in the Ser- " mon ; Becauſe You think no Reaſon can " be given, why the Juſtice of God ſhould " not require, that All the Particles of Mat- " ter, as well as any Part of Them, which " were joyned with the Soul, in the whole " Courſe of its Actions, good, or bad, in " this Life, ſhould not be joyned with it, " in Reward, or Puniſhment, in the other " Life ". This is the Sum of what You have to ſay againſt this Argument, For the Reſurrection of the *Same Body*, from the Agreableneſs which ſuch a Reſurrection bears to the Divine Juſtice. And You may ſee, above, in the Citations made, from the Ancient Writers of the Chriſtian Church, that, it is an Argument, which ſome of Them were not aſhamed to make Uſe of. Nor is it in the leaſt improperly ſuited to that Notion of the *Sameneſs* of the Reſurrection *Body*, which the Sermon aſſerts. For, if an Human *Body* be truly, and properly, the *Same*, after the Reſur- rection, with That, which lived before, which conſiſts, not of All the Particles, which were ever united to the Soul, in this

this Life, but only, of as many of Them, as would at any Time, in this Life, be ſufficient to have it *Vulgarly* called the *Same*; which is the Notion of *Identity* ſtated in the Sermon; then it certainly repreſents All that Unconſcious Matter, which was ever joyned to the Soul, in the good, or evil Actions of this Life. And if it repreſents the human *Body*, under All theſe ſeveral Circumſtances of Variation, and of Guilt, or Goodneſs, in this Life; then, it, certainly, cannot be diſagreable to the divine Juſtice to Puniſh, or Reward it, together with the Puniſhment, or Reward, of the Soul, in the other Life. It is certain, the Body is often Puniſhed by God for the Sake and Sins of the Soul, in this Life; and it is certainly moſt agreable to Divine Juſtice, that it ſhould be ſo Puniſhed. But will any Man ſay, that it cannot be agreable to Divine Juſtice to Puniſh it, in this Life, except it conſiſts of the very *ſame preciſe* Number of Particles, in which the Sin was committed? How ridiculous is This! And How contrary to the common Experience of the Patience, and Forbearance of Divine Juſtice, which is not leſs exact, when it is ſlow, and late, in Puniſhing. Whereas, if it was neceſſary for Divine Juſtice to puniſh the *Body*, while it conſiſted of the *very ſame* Numerical Particles, in which the

the Sin was committed, it must always, *strike* immediately, and never delay Punishment; since the very next Minute, according to Mr. *Lock*, it could not be the *same Body*, in which the Sin was committed.

And, if the Justice of God may, in this Manner, afflict the *Body*, for the Sins of the Soul in this Life, without any Regard had, whether it be, *Mathematically*, or, but only, *Vulgarly* the *Same*, with that, in which the Sins were committed; There can be no Reason given, why it may not, in the same Manner, punish, or reward it, with the Soul in the other Life. Justice, whether considered, as Human, or Divine, regards not such trifling Subtleties. It is the Punishment, or Reward of the *Man*, about which Justice is concerned. And because the *Man* consists of *Soul* and *Body*, the *Body* is always Considered, after a *Vulgar* Manner to be the *Same*; And is Punished, or Rewarded, with the *Soul*, as *such*, when the *Man* is Punished or Rewarded. Thus, Human Justice, for Example, will Punish a Man, at Fifty Years of Age, and very justly, for a Murder which He committed at Twenty; tho' the *Body*, in which He committed the Murder at Twenty, according to Mr. *Lock*, cannot possibly be *the same*, in which He suffers at

at Fifty. And in the ſame Manner, at the Reſurrection of the Dead; The *Man* cannot be ſaid to be Puniſhed, or Rewarded, except his Body, as well as his Soul, be Puniſhed or Rewarded. And if it is highly agreable to Divine Juſtice, that the *Man* ſhould be Puniſhed, or Rewarded, it muſt be agreable alſo, that his *Body* ſhould be Puniſhed or Rewarded. And if it be agreable to Divine Juſtice, that the *Body* ſhould be Puniſhed or Rewarded, No Queſtion can be made, but that it muſt be meant of the *Same Body*, in which the *Man* deſerved Rewards and Puniſhments.

But enough of This. Since if You allow, as You do, and muſt, that by the Rules of divine Juſtice, the Unconſcious Matter may be joyned with the *Soul*, in Reward, or Puniſhment, as God at firſt *bleſſed*, and afterwards, *curſed* the Ground, out of which *Adam* was formed, for His Sake, and Sin, as the Sermon ſpeaks, it is manifeſt, You do, and muſt allow, that it is congruous to Divine Juſtice to Puniſh or Reward the *Body*, as well as the *Soul*, when the *Man* is Puniſhed or Rewarded. And if the *Same Man*, which lived before, is Puniſhed or Rewarded, the *Same Body*, in which He lived before, muſt be Puniſhed or Rewarded.

But,

But, You are alſo, further, to be told Here, that, when any Thing is ſaid to be agreable to Divine Juſtice, it is ſaid to be ſo, according to our human Conceptions of it. Which, tho' ever ſo true, and rational, ought nevertheleſs to be modeſtly expreſſed. Arguments from Congruities of this Kind, imply no more than Moral, and not Phyſical Neceſſity. This for the Proof of the Reſurrection of the *Same Body*, from its Congruity to the Divine Juſtice, or Nature of God.

SECT. II.

The Congruity, from the Nature of Man, Conſidered, and Defended.

YOU paſs to the Second Congruity, which the Sermon affirms to be in the Soul of Man, to receive Eternal Happineſs, or Miſery, in its own proper, and the *Same Body*.

Now, in Order to prove This, the Sermon aſſerts, that there ſeems to be a certain Congruity of the Soul of Man with Matter. This is, Firſt, proved, and from thence the Inference is drawn, That, if the Soul of Man hath a Congruity with Matter, it is highly probable, that it ſhould have

have a Congruity with that Matter, *the Body*, in which it lived, and from which it was ſeparated by Death, and in which it diſpoſed itſelf, to enjoy, or ſuffer, Bliſs, or Woe without End, in another Life. This is the Argument in ſhort View, which You here addreſs Yourſelf againſt.

But, firſt, You muſt do Juſtice to Your Friend. And therefore You tell me, that "I quote Mr. *Lock*, in the Margin, for "ſaying the contrary, *after His Manner*; "an Expreſſion, which, You ſay, is uſed "more than once, in the Sermon, tho' "what is intended by it, You cannot "gueſs". But would You have Me think, that You cannot gueſs, whether Your Friend had not a particular Manner of ſaying Things? Is it not plain, from his Works, that He had many artful Ways of expreſſing his Senſe? And that, by a dextrous Manner of Inſinuation, He often denyed, or affirmed, Things, which He did not ſeem, *openly*, either to deny, or to affirm. I think, I have already given You Inſtances of This His Manner of expreſſing Himſelf. Or if I had not, the Words You cite from Him are an Inſtance. The Words are theſe, as You cite Them, (*i*) "What greater Con-

(*i*) 3 Lett. *p.* 177.

"gruity

" gruity the Soul hath with any Particles " of Matter, which were once vitally uni- " ted to it, but are now ſo no longer, than " it hath with Particles of Matter, which " it was never united to, would be hard to " determine, if that ſhould be demanded". For, Here, Mr. *Lock* ſeems to be ſo much in Haſte, or to think ſo contemptibly of the Queſtion, that He would not demand, what greater Congruity the *Soul* had to thoſe Particles of Matter, which were once formerly united to it, than to thoſe, which were never united to it. And yet, at the ſame Time, This Queſtion contains All his Doctrine of the Reſurrection, in the Belly of it; and implies, that it would be as agreable to the Nature of the *Soul*, to be united to a *New Body*, at the Reſurrection, as to the Old Body, in which it lived before. This is Mr. *Lock*'s Manner of expreſſing Himſelf, and it was ſuitable to a Man of his Art in managing Diſpute. And, that, what He intended in theſe Words is contrary to what the Sermon advances, concerning the Congruity of the *Soul* to that *Old Body*, in which it once dwelt before Death, is manifeſt. And this is the Contrariety, for which He is referred to in the Margin of the Sermon, and no other. And This, it is plain, You ſaw, tho' You pretend not to ſee it. For immediately after Mr. *Lock*'s Words, You ask " how This

" Queſtion can be determined, or by what
" Reaſons, which will not equally conclude
" for a Congruity of the Soul with all the
" Particles of Matter, which were ever
" united to it, as with any Part of Them,
" *i. e.* with thoſe Parts of the Old Matter
" which You think ſufficient to make up
" Your *Same Body*.

Now, Firſt, as to Mr. *Lock*'s Queſtion I anſwer; That the *Soul* of Man being intended by God for an *embodied* State; and to prepare itſelf, according to the Actions done in the *Body*, for Happineſs, or Miſery, without End, in a Future Life; it muſt ſeem moſt congruous, for it to be united to That *Body*, in which it ſo acted, and prepared itſelf, rather than to any Other, to which it never was united, and in which it never deſerved, either ſuch Happineſs, or ſuch Miſery. For many of thoſe Virtues, for which eternal Happineſs is promiſed, conſiſt in the Sufferings and Mortifications of the Body, and the Appetites of it, in the Language of Scripture. And Many of thoſe Sins, which are threatned with Eternal Miſeries, conſiſt in gratifying the Luſts, and Senſual Deſires of the *Body*. And what can ſeem more congruous, than that, the *Soul* ſhould be rewarded, in that *Body*, whoſe Sufferings, and Mortifications, gave Birth to thoſe Virtues,

tues, for which it was rewarded? Or what more congruous than that the *Soul* ſhould be puniſhed, in that Body, the Indulgence to the Luſts, and Appetites of which, gave Birth to thoſe Sins, for which it is to be for ever puniſhed? In ſhort, if the *Same Man*, who conſiſted of a *Body* and *Soul*, muſt be rewarded, for ever, for His Virtues, how can He be Rewarded without the *Body*, in which He lived a Life of Virtue? And if the *Same Man* is to be puniſhed, for ever, for his Sins, How can He be puniſhed, but in that *Body*, in which He Lived, and Sinned?

And, in the next Place, as to Your own Queſtion, "Whether theſe Reaſons will "not equally conclude that the Soul hath "a Congruity with All the Particles of "Matter, that were ever united to it, as "much as with any Part of them"? I anſwer, that, the Reaſons here given are taken from the *Moral*, and not the *Natural* Congruities of the *Soul*. And therefore, ſince the *Body* at the Reſurrection is the *Same* with That which lived, and dyed, not, by having all the Particles united to it, which ever were united to it; but only, by ſuch, as are ſufficient, at any Time, in this Life, to have it thought, *Vulgarly*, to be the Same: All the Congruities of the *Soul*, which require that it ſhould be joyned

joyned with the *Body*, in its Eternal Rewards, and Puniſhments, will only determine it to *This Body*, Since in *This Body* They will All be ſufficiently anſwered, *This Body*, alone, being always thought to be the Suffering, Mortified, *Body* of the Virtuous, and the Pamper'd, Indulged, Debauched, *Body* of the Vicious, and Corrupt.

And thus, You ſee, Sir, that notwithſtanding Your idle Fears, the Sermon continues to be very conſiſtent with itſelf; and is neither obliged to quit its own State of the *Sameneſs* of the Reſurrection *Body*; much leſs, to take Refuge in Mr. *Lock*'s; Nor to relinquiſh the Argument, from the Congruities in the Nature of God, and Man. And therefore, You muſt forgive Me, If I adviſe You, for the future, never to talk with Confidence of what other People *muſt* be forced to do, upon certain nice Occaſions. They may be capable of making an abler Defence than You imagine; and may order Their Affairs better than You dream of. And tho' the Sermon juſtly acknowledges, theſe Congruities would be nothing but Imagination, if the Reſurrection of the *Same Body* were not the Doctrine of Scripture; Yet when This appears to be the Doctrine of Scripture, They are not then, Nothing but Imagination;

gination ; but are bright Illuſtrations, and ſtrong and proper Confirmations of the ſame Divine Truth. And that the Scriptures, which I have produced, do ſupport this Doctrine, I think I have made Undeniably appear. And I appeal, as You alſo do to the Unprejudiced upon it, tho' to ſay the Truth, a Man, whoſe whole Doctrine depends upon a Prejudice for Mr. *Lock*, as Your's does, ſeems to have very little Right, or Reaſon, to call for an Unprejudiced Reader, and Judge of it.

SECT. III.

No Reſurrection, without the Reſurrection of the Same Body.

AT the Cloſe of this Head, You further take Notice of Theſe Words in the Sermon. " If We are ſtill confidently op-
" poſed in the Doctrine of the Reſurrection
" of the *Same Body* with this Fallacy, That,
" the Reſurrection of the Dead is the only
" Language of Scripture ; and that, the Re-
" ſurrection of the Dead implies no more
" than that, Perſons once Dead ſhall liv
" again ; We may, and muſt, give up thi
" Article of the Reſurrection. Foraſmuch
" as They who deny any Reſurrection, d
" yet believe that Perſons dying in thi

" World, may, or do ſtill live in another "? Upon this Paſſage You tell me, that " I " am ſo warmed with the Heat of Argu- " ment, that rather than part with the " *Identity* of the *Riſing Body*, I will part " with the Reſurrection itſelf. " What an Advantage it is to be Cool? You think, it ſeems, that theſe Two Things, the *Identity* of the *Riſing Body*, and the Reſurrection of the Dead, may be eaſily parted. But I aſſure You, I am very ſincere, when I tell You, that I cannot underſtand the One, without the Other. It is to me inconceivable, that there ſhould be a Reſurrection, where there is Nothing Raiſed again. If the *Body* is the Part of a Man, that falls, and is diſſolved by Death; It appears to Me perfectly unavoidable, that the Raiſing That *Body*, and Joining it again, in Vital Union, with the *Soul*, muſt be the only Reſurrection of the Dead. So that, to part with the *Identity* of the *Riſing Body* is the ſame Thing, to me, with parting with the Reſurrection itſelf.

But, You tell me, that, What the Sermon calls a Fallacy, that is, that the Reſurrection of the Dead is the only Language of Scripture, Mr. *Lock* has ſufficiently ſhewed, in his Comment on 1 *Cor.* 15. and Third Letter, to be a certain, and plain, Truth. This, I, entirely, and ut-

terly, deny. I doubt not, but the Anſwers I have given to what Mr. *Lock* offers, in both thoſe Places, are ſufficient to prove, His Comments, and Reaſonings, to be *ſcandalouſly* falſe, and fallacious. And if it were poſſible for You, Yourſelf to conſider Them *impartially*, I could preſume, that You would be of the ſame Mind.

SECT. IV.

Mr. Lock's *State of the Reſurrection, by which the* Souls *of Men are ſuppoſed to be united to* New *and* Other *Bodies, No proper Reſurrection but a* New Life.

BUT You ſay, that "When This Pro-
"poſition, the Reſurrection of the
"Dead is the only Language of Scripture,
"is aſcribed to Mr. *Lock*, there is ano-
"ther joyned with it, which Mr. *Lock*
"has no where ſaid, that This Reſurrec-
"tion of the Dead implies no More, than
"that Perſons once Dead ſhall live again.
"This, with a ſolemn Air, You ask, how
"I can juſtify, by ſetting it down as His
"Words, by a Reference in the Margin,
"So Mr. *Lock*, and gravely leave it up-
"on Me to conſider". But, Sir, tho' Mr. *Lock* perhaps has not Thoſe very Words, Yet may He not have Words, which

which bear that Senſe, and Import? Or at leaſt, May not That Propoſition be, clearly, and juſtly, deduced from His Words? In either of theſe Caſes, *So Mr.* Lock, in the Margin, can be no *unjuſt* Reference, nor will it need any other Juſtification.

And that, Mr. *Lock*'s Doctrine of the Reſurrection of the Dead implies no More, than that, Perſons once dead ſhall live again, has I think been, clearly, and fully proved already. For when He tells Us "that Men ſhall have *Other Bodies* at "the Reſurrection; (*k*) when He tells Us, "that St. *Paul*'s Determination is not in "Favour of the *Same Body*; when He "tells Us, that the *Body* Raiſed is *diffe-* "*rent* from That, which was Laid down; "(*l*) when He inſinuates, that a *Body* "which conſiſts of *None* of the ſame Par- "ticles, which were united to the *Soul* "in this Life, may be the Reſurrection "*Body* of the Dead; or that a *Body* en- "tirely *New* may be a Reſurrection *Bo-* "*dy*; (*m*) when He ſays, that the *Same* "*Perſon* ſhall be Raiſed, His Perſona- "lity conſiſting only in the Conſciouſ-

(*k*) Not. on 1 Cor. 15. 35, &c.
(*l*) 3 Lett. *p.* 201.
(*m*) —— *p.* 196, 172, 174.

" neſs of the Soul; (*n*) when He ſays, " that if the *Same Man* Riſe, who was " Dead, it may properly be called a Re- " ſurrection of the Dead, meaning only, " when *His Soul* is united to live a *New* " *Life* in a *New Body*; (*o*) when He, " every where, conſtantly diſputes againſt " the Reſurrection of the *Body*; and de- " nies it to be found in Scripture;" When, I ſay, He does All *This*, What can be a more juſt Inference from His Doctrine of the Reſurrection, than that it implies only that *Perſons* once dead ſhall live again? And ſo He was told by the Biſhop of *Worceſter*, as He cites Him himſelf. But He makes no proper Anſwer to Him, only inſiſting *poſitively*, without any Reaſon, in the Words cited before. " I think, it " will not be queſtioned, that if the *Same* " *Man* riſe who was dead, it may very " properly be called a Reſurrection of the " Dead.

And You have Learned to ſpeak the ſame Language. For tho' You ſay, " Thoſe, " who own the Reſurrection of the Dead, " mean more by it, than that, *Perſons*, " dying in this World, do ſtill live in ano-

(*n*) —— *p.* 205.
(*o*) —— *p.* 209.

" ther ",

" ther ", Yet when You come to explain, what You underſtand by the Reſurrection of the Dead; All the Account You give of it, is, that " the Riſing muſt be under- " ſtood of That, which dyed ", not meaning *the Body*, but, as You explain Yourſelf, " the Same *Species*, a Creature con- " ſiſting of *Soul*, and *Body*, the *Same* " *Man* muſt be raiſed at the Laſt Day ". And I could be glad to know, how this Reſurrection of the Dead implies any Thing more, than that Perſons dying, in this World, do ſtill live in another. For when You ſpeak of a Creature conſiſting of *Soul*, and *Body*, You ſpeak, as You call it, of the *Species* only, of Man in general, or of the *human Nature*, conſidered, *Abſtractedly*, not of particular Men, the *Individuals* of that *Species*, and who are the only proper Subjects of the Reſurrection. Thoſe Words therefore of Yours, if You ſpeak of the Human Species in general, can be, certainly, Nothing to the Purpoſe. And when You ſpeak of the *Same Man*, You cannot, by Mr. *Lock*'s Doctrine, mean, the *Same particular Man*, conſiſting of the *Same Soul*, and the *Same Body*. But, if by a Creature conſiſting of a *Soul*, and a *Body*, and the *Same Man*, You mean that a Creature, and the *Same Man*, conſiſting of the *Same Soul*, and *Another*, or *New Body*, muſt be Raiſed at the

Laſt Day, What does This imply more, than that a *Perſon*, in Mr. *Lock*'s Senſe of *Perſon*, who once died in this World, ſhall live again, in *Another*, and *New Body*, in a Future State? Where is the Reſurrection, the Raiſing up again That which fell, The Reſtoring of That which was diſſolved, the Reuniting thoſe Two Parts, which You allow a Man to conſiſt of, which Death had ſeparated, His *Body*, and His *Soul*, in all This? You may, if You pleaſe, confidently call This, as Your *Teacher* does, a Reſurrection. But You have no Foundation to call it ſo, in the Propriety of the Word, or in the Nature of the Thing, or in the Scriptures; as I have abundantly proved. A *Renovation* indeed, or a *New Life* in a *New Body*, This may, properly, be called, and This is what I call it, when I ſay, that it implies no more, than that *Perſons*, dying in This World, may live again in Another.

You ſay that "being raiſed from the "Dead has manifeſtly a quite different Sig-"nification". And I grant it, when underſtood of the *Same Bodies* of Men, which lived and dyed. But when Underſtood of the Union of the *Souls* of Men with *Other Bodies*, at the Laſt Day, I cannot ſee how any proper Conſtruction of Words can make

make it to be any Thing elſe, but to be Renewed, or to Live again in a *New Body*.

You continue to ſay, that "Thoſe who "believe This, believe Something more, "than that, an *Unembodied* Spirit, ſuch "as is the *Soul*, when ſeparated from the "Body, continues to live elſewhere". I grant it, but What then? Where does the Sermon mention an *Unembodied* Spirit? The Words there are, "They, who "deny any Reſurrection, do yet believe, "that Perſons dying, in This World, may, "or do, ſtill live in another". And, there are ſuch as call Themſelves Chriſtians, who believe This, not of Unembodied Spirits or ſeparated *Souls*; but of *Souls* united to *Other*, *New*, and *Heavenly*, Bodies; who, yet, expreſly deny the Reſurrection of the Dead.

Tho' You believe therefore, Something more, than They do, who barely believe the ſeparate Exiſtence of the *Soul*, Yet while You believe with Mr. *Lock*, that at the Laſt Day the *Souls* of Men ſhall be united with *Other*, and *New Bodies*; You only believe, that They enter upon a *New Life* in a *New Body*; and You have loſt and denyed the Reſurrection. And therefore You are ſtill within the Reach

Reach and Force of the Words of the Sermon, which I ſhall again ſet before You. " If We are ſtill confidently oppo-
" ſed in our Belief of the *Identity* of the
" Riſing Body, with this Fallacy, that the
" Reſurrection of the Dead is the only
" Language of Scripture, and This im-
" plies no More, than that Perſons once
" Dead ſhall live again, We may, and
" muſt give up This Article of the Re-
" ſurrection, Foraſmuch as They, who de-
" ny any Reſurrection, do Yet believe,
" that *Perſons* dying, in This World, may,
" or do, ſtill live in Another ".

'Tis pleaſant, therefore, to hear You telling Me, that, *This* is Mr. *Lock*'s Faith, and that He would Zealouſly have contended for it againſt Me. For as I do not doubt, that He had Zeal enough to contend for His own Opinion, even againſt All the World, tho' never ſo falſe, new, and particular; ſo I can allow, that You ſpeak proper enough, when You call This Doctrine of the Reſurrection, Mr. *Lock*'s Faith, ſince I am ſure that, I have largely proved, that is not the *Chriſtian*.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

The Fourth Enquiry of the Sermon paſſed over.

WE are now come to the Fourth Enquiry of the Sermon, What is the true Foundation of a Chriſtian's Belief of the Truth of the Reſurrection againſt the Difficulties objected to it. And This, partly, becauſe, You ſay, Mr. *Lock* is not at all concerned in it; and partly, beauſe the Texts, urged in it, have been conſidered by You, as They have been by Me already; You diſmiſs unmoleſted, and with ſome little Degree of Your Favour. And therefore I am obliged in the ſame Manner to diſmiſs it.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

The Fifth Enquiry of the Sermon, as far as Mr. Lock *is concerned in it, Conſidered, and Defended.*

AND ſo We come to the Fifth, and Laſt, Enquiry, By What Fault of Men, or Times, the Doctrine of the Reſurrection is diſputed, or denied? And, in this Enquiry, You take Mr. *Lock* to be as little concerned, as in the former. Only, for Fear, Any Reflections might be thought applicable to Him, which are made upon the Conſideration of Two Faults, mentioned in the Sermon, as Occaſions of Diſputing againſt, or Denying the Reſurrection, i. e. *A Falſe Value ſet upon Human Reaſon*, and *a falſe Method of interpreting Scripture;* You think Yourſelf obliged to tell the World, How clear Mr. *Lock* was from the Guilt of Thoſe Two Faults.

AND

And for His Innocence as to the Firſt, You appeal to His *Eſſay concerning Human Underſtanding*, and to His Account of Reaſon and Faith, and their Provinces in it. And This, at preſent, I have nothing to ſay againſt, and You cannot, in This Reſpect, ſay, He is charged as Guilty.

But when You ſay, that Mr. *Lock* has not given the *leaſt* Cauſe to ſuſpect Him, as Guilty of the other Fault, namely, of any *ſiniſter* Deſign, in His Interpretations of Scripture; it is impoſſible it ſhould be granted. I have made the contrary, undeniably, to appear. I will freely confeſs, that Mr. *Lock* was particularly in my Thoughts, in what was ſpoken, upon this Occaſion, in the Sermon. He was One of thoſe Men of Abilities to interpret, or explain, the Scriptures, without the other neceſſary Qualifications, there intended. It is true, the Sermon ſays, that there is no Security given, That Every ſuch Man of Abilities to interpret Scripture, ſhall bring, even, common Honeſty with Him, to that Work. But thoſe Words do not oblige You to imagine that any ſuch Security could be had; They imply only, that, tho' it was entirely neceſſary, in ſuch a Work, yet it was impoſſible to be given.

But

But You ſay, Mr. *Lock* has given Security, that He was Nothing of all That, againſt which Security is Here demanded; that, He was neither, Atheiſt, Deiſt, or Freethinker, in the ill Acceptation of that Word; and that His Mind was not tinctured with falſe, and depraved, Opinions. And, particularly You ſay, He is None of thoſe, who are complained of to have denyed thoſe great Articles of our Faith, *the Bleſſed Trinity; the Divinity of our Saviour; the Satisfaction our Bleſſed Lord has paid for our Sins;* or *the Unity and Communion of the Church.* Now as theſe particular Articles are thoſe, which I have charged, and proved upon Him, in the Beginning of theſe Papers, to be denied by Him; So for this His Denial, it is evident, that His Mind was tinctured with Depraved Opinions, and that, if He was not an Atheiſt, or a Deiſt, therefore, He was, at leaſt, a Freethinker, in the ill Acceptation of that Word. And All This I have from His own Writings ſufficiently evinced. And You may, with as good Aſſurance ſay, that Mr. *Lock* did not deny the Reſurrection of the *Same Body*, as that He did not deny Theſe Other Great, and Important Articles of the Chriſtian Religion. It is Your Misfortune to have ſuffered Your partial Fondneſs for Him

Him to pervert You into His Opinions, and it ſeems, You could not be of His Opinions, without defending Them.

But You ſhould have been ſure, that Your Opinions, and Defence, were ſolidly ſupported, and rationally maintained, before You inſolently pronounced, that, "You could not without Indignation ſee "the Reſurrection of the *Same Body* ran-"ged with the other Articles of the Chri-"ſtian Faith". For a Man, who defends, only, an Uncommon and New Opinion, ought, in Diſcretion, to defend it, with Modeſty; ſince Impudence added to Novelty, makes it more unſufferable. But a Man, that defends an *Hereſy*, with whatever Indignation He may ſee Himſelf oppoſed, and the Truth defended againſt Him; yet, in Prudence, ought to let no ſuch hot Expreſſions drop from Him; leſt His Errors, while They are pityed for Their Weakneſs, ſhould be deteſted for the Malice, and Arrogance, which attends Them.

But You go on, in this Heat, here, in the Cloſe of Your Letter, very Magiſterially, to draw up a Summary View of this Doctrine of the Reſurrection of the *Same Body*, "that it is doubtful in its "Meaning; variouſly underſtood; not "determined clearly by the Scriptures; of

"little

" little Importance to be determined; and " that All, that is of Conſequence to the " great Ends of Religion, in the Article " of the Reſurrection, is ſufficiently ſecu- " red without it". As if You had proved, or were capable of proving, any One of the Characters, which You here give of This Doctrine, to be true.

And therefore, in Return, I think I may have alſo the Liberty to repeat to You, what, I preſume, upon the Whole, has been now *Clearly* proved; That the Doctrine of the Reſurrection of the *Same Body* is Clear; and Diſtinct in its Meaning; has been *Uniformly* underſtood; and *Conſtantly* received, in the Catholick Church of Chriſt; That it is partly delivered to us, in the expreſs Words, and partly, deduced from the Clear and Natural Senſe, of the Scriptures; That what God has been pleaſed to determine in the Scriptures, cannot, without Profaneneſs, be ſaid, to be of little Importance to be determin'd; That the Article of the Reſurrection cannot be *truly* believed, except it be believed in the ſame Manner, in which God in the Scriptures hath determined it; and that no good Chriſtian can, without a true Faith of the Reſurrection, ſecure the great Ends of Religion in the Article of the Reſurrection. And, I will have

Leave

Leave to tell You, therefore, that tho' it is of no great Conſequence to conſider, what You do ſee, or do not ſee, Yet that it is of infinite Service to the Chriſtian Religion, to defend, and maintain, the Antient, and True, Faith of it. That the Queſtion concerning the Reſurrection of the *Same Body* is not a Queſtion of Curioſity; as You affect to call it. But, a Truth revealed by God in the Scriptures; and in conſequence, a Neceſſary Article of the Chriſtian Faith. And therefore, whatever High-flown Opinions You, and ſome Friends of His, may entertain of Mr. *Lock*; I will have the Reſolution to think, That, while He *obſtinately* denied the Reſurrection of the *Body*, and of the *Same Body*, He was an Heretick, in the Article of the Reſurrection. And That in that *Uncertainty* of Mind, in which He ſeems to have been, concerning it, He might poſſibly alſo entirely disbelieve a Reſurrection.

YET, with Your uſual Formality, and Aſſurance, You give Me theſe Words, as it were, at parting, "that every Man ſhall "be raiſed again at the Laſt Day in *His* "*own, proper Body*, to be Puniſhed, or "Rewarded, according to what He hath "done in This Life. And That, Thoſe, "who have pleaſed God, ſhall with Their

" *own* Eyes, and not *Another's*, ſee God, " are Truths, in which Mr. *Lock* and You " agree ". But, the Falſeneſs, and Prevarication of this Agreement, I have already told You of; and You ought to be aſhamed that it is repeated, ſince Mr. *Lock*'s *own proper Body*, and *Thoſe Eyes*, with which He ſuppoſes, Men, *ſhall ſee God*, at the Laſt Day, are as entirely different from Thoſe, which the Sermon ſpeaks of, as a *New Body* given to a Man, at the Reſurrection, can be ſuppoſed to be, from the *Old Body*, in which He lived, and died, when it is Raiſed, and Changed at the Laſt Day. And This You very well knew.

WHETHER, You thought the Doctrine of the *Same Body* worth Diſpute, or no, I leave therefore to Yourſelf. That You have diſputed, here, a great deal againſt it, by the Help of Your Friend's Materials, is manifeſt. But neither You, nor All Mr. *Lock*'s Friends together, with All, that He hath ſaid himſelf, or taught You to ſay, have proved, or can prove, that it is not an Article of Faith.

CON-

CONCLUSION.

AND therefore, ſince You leave Me to conſider it, I take Leave to tell You, that I think I have made good the Charge of the Title Page of the Sermon, againſt Mr. *Lock*, of *Cavils*, *falſe Reaſonings*, and *falſe Interpretations* of Scripture. And for your own Part, I cannot find, You have ſaid any Thing, that could, in the leaſt, convince Me, That I have born too hard upon Him; And therefore, as I have done Him no Wrong, I am under no Obligation, either, to make Him any *Publick* Reparation, or, ſo much as *Privately* to repent of it. On the contrary, it appears to Me, that I do God, and Religion, and the Chriſtian World, Good Service, by heartily endeavouring to confute, and expoſe, His Heretical Opinions; and by warning Others of the Infection, and Danger of Them. And I cannot but think, that it is You Yourſelf, who ought to make Publick Reparation to the Church of Chriſt, the Chriſtian Name and Faith, that You have been ſo *ſcandalouſly* engaged, in Defence of Notorious Hereſy,

againſt Them. And upon the Whole; as I did not deſire, at Firſt, that You ſhould beſtow the Leaſt Pains upon Me; ſo I aſſure You, I cannot change my Sentiments of Mr. *Lock*, and His Doctrines, not only, for all the Eſteem, and Reſpect, but alſo for any Thing elſe, of much greater Value, which either, You, or any Body in this World can give Me, and therefore, I conclude with telling You, that I reſolve to have no more Trouble of This Nature from You.

I am, SIR,

Your &c.

5 OC 57

FINIS.

BOOKS Printed for C. RIVINGTON, *at the* Bible *and* Crown *in St.* Paul's *Church-Yard.*

I. *THE* SACRED CLASSICKS *Defended and Illuſtrated:* Or, An Eſſay humbly offer'd towards proving the Purity, Propriety, and true Eloquence of the Writers of the New Teſtament. In Two Parts. In the Firſt of which thoſe Divine Writers are vindicated againſt the Charge of barbarous Language, falſe Greek, and Soleciſms. In the Second is ſhewn, That all the Excellencies of Style, and ſublime Beauties of Language and genuine Eloquence do abound in the Sacred Writers of the New Teſtament. With an Account of their Style and Character, and a Repreſentation of their Superiority, in ſeveral Inſtances, to the beſt Claſſicks of *Greece* and *Rome*. To which are ſubjoin'd proper Indexes. By *A. Blackwall*, M. A.

II. *Tertullian*'s Preſcription againſt Hereticks; and the Apologeticks of St. *Theophilus*, Biſhop of *Antioch* to *Autolycus*, againſt the Malicious Calumniators of the Chriſtian Religion. Tranſlated from their reſpective Originals, with Notes and Preliminary Diſſertations. By *Joſeph Betty*, M. A. Fellow of *Exeter* College, *Oxon.*

III. *A Rationale*: Or Practical Expoſition of the Book of Common Prayer. By the Right Reverend Father in God, *Anthony Sparrow*, D. D. Late Lord Biſhop of *Norwich*. With his Caution to his Dioceſe againſt *Falſe Doctrines*, and his famous Sermon of *Confeſſion* and the Power of *Abſolution.*

ſolution. The Seventh Edition. To which are prefix'd, The Lives of the Compilers of the Liturgy; and an Hiſtorical Account of its ſeveral Reviews. By the Reverend Mr. *Samuel Downes*, Late of St. *John*'s College, *Oxon.* The Second Edition.

IV. A Companion for the Grand Feſtival of the Chriſtian Church, or the Lord's-Day. With *Forms* of *Prayer* and *Praiſe* for the Aſſiſtance of *Private Devotion.* And *Directions* for the more Devout Attendance on the Publick Worſhip of GOD, according to the Liturgy of the Church of *England.* Being a Supplement to Mr. *Nelſon*'s Companion for the *Faſts* and *Feſtivals*, &c.

V. The True *Church* of *England* Man's Companion in the Cloſet: Or, A Compleat Manual of Private Devotions. Collected from the Writings of Archbiſhop *Laud*, Biſhop *Andrews*, Biſhop *Kenn*, Dr. *Hickes*, Mr. *Kettlewell*, Mr. *Spinckes*, and other eminent Divines of the Church of *England.* With a Preface by the Reverend Mr. *Spinckes.* The Fourth Edition corrected.

VI. The *Chriſtian Pilgrimage*: Or, A Companion for the Holy Seaſon of *Lent*: Being Meditations upon the Paſſion, Death, Reſurrection, and Aſcenſion of our Bleſſed Lord and Saviour, *Jeſus Chriſt.* Divided into Eighteen Stations, with Prayers ſuited to each. Written orginally in *French*, and recommended to the Uſe of all true Lovers of Devotion, by the late pious and learned Monſ. *De Fenelon*, Archbiſhop of *Cambray.* Made *Engliſh* by Mrs. *Jane Barker*, of *Wilſthorp*, near *Stamford* in *Lincolnſhire.*

VII. The Complete Art of POETRY. In Six Parts. I. Of the Nature, Uſe, Excellence, Riſe and Progreſs of Poetry, &c. II. Of the Uſe and

and Neceſſity of Rules in Poetry. III. Of the Manner, Rules, and Art of Compoſing Epigrams, Paſtorals, Odes, *&c.* IV. Of Tragedy and Comedy, how to draw the Plot, and form the Characters of both. V. The Rules of the Epic or Narrative Poem. Of the Poetic Diction or Language, and of *Engliſh* Numbers. VI. A Collection of the moſt beautiful Deſcriptions, Similes, Alluſions, *&c.* from *Spencer*, and our beſt *Engliſh* Poets, as well Ancient as Modern. *Shakeſpeariana:* Or, The moſt beautiful Topicks, Deſcriptions, and Similes that occur throughout all *Shakeſpear*'s Plays. By *Charles Gildon*, Gent. The Second Edition. Vol. I.

VIII. The Relative Duties of *Parents* and *Children*, *Husbands* and *Wives*, *Maſters* and *Servants*; Conſider'd in Sixteen Practical Diſcourſes: With Three Sermons upon the Caſe of *Self-Murther*. By *William Fleetwood*, D. D. Late Lord Biſhop of *Ely*. The Third Edition. Neceſſary for all Families.

IX. Biſhop *Parker*'s Hiſtory of His Own Time. In Four Books. Faithfully Tranſlated from the *Latin* Original, by *Thomas Newlin*, M. A. Vicar of *Beeding* in *Suſſex*, and late Fellow of *Magdalen* College, in *Oxford*.

X. The Works of *Flavius Joſephus:* Tranſlated into Engliſh by Sir *Roger L'Eſtrange*, Knt. *viz.* I. The Antiquity of the *Jews*, in Twenty Books. II. Their Wars with the *Romans*, in Seven Books. III. The Life of *Joſephus*, written by Himſelf. IV. His Book againſt *Apion*, in Defence of the Antiquities of the *Jews*, in Two Parts. V. The Martyrdom of the *Maccabees*. As alſo, VI. *Philo*'s Embaſſy from the *Jews* of *Alexandria* to *Caius Caligula*. All carefully revis'd, and compar'd with the

the Original *Greek*. To which are added, Two Diſcourſes and Several Remarks and Obſervations upon *Joſephus*. Together with Maps, Sculptures, and Accurate Indexes. The Fourth Edition, with the Addition of a New Map of *Paleſtine*, the Temple of *Jeruſalem*, and the Genealogy of *Herod* the *Great*, taken from *Villalpandus*, *Reland*, &c.

XI. Certain Sermons, Or, Homilies appointed to be Read in the Church in the Time of Queen *Elizabeth* of Famous Memory.

5 OC 57